ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

270
Robertson
History of the
Christian Church
R559h
v.2,pt.1
1867486
STORAGE

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

STO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-184

4488

HISTORY

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE GREGORY THE GREAT
TO THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS

(A.D. 590–1122).

V. 2, pt. 1

By JAMES CRAIGIE ROBERTSON, M.A.,

VICAR OF BEKESBOURNE, IN THE DIOCESE OF CANTERBURY.

THE
NEWBERRY
LIBRARY.
CHICAGO

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1856.

1867486

R. W. Landers -
Aug. 8. 1857.

HISTORY

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

1867196

A 18 1

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

PREFACE.

THIS volume is a continuation of the "History of the Christian Church to the Pontificate of Gregory the Great," which was published three years ago. The main story is now brought down to the end of the contest between the Papacy and the Empire on the subject of Investitures; but the Third Book is rather to be regarded as the commencement of a larger division than as complete in itself.

As many of the Chronicles, Biographies, Acts of Councils, Letters, or other authorities which are cited, may be found in more than one of the collections which I have habitually used, it may be well to inform the reader that I have generally contented myself with giving a reference for each document to the work in which I have myself examined it.

J. C. R.

Bekesbourne, near Canterbury,
November 28, 1856.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

FROM THE ELECTION OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE, A.D. 590—814.

CHAPTER I.

GREGORY THE GREAT, A.D. 590—604; COLUMBAN, A.D. 589—615.

	Page
TRANSITION to the Middle Ages	1
Gregory	2
Controversy with Eutychius	*ib.*
Election as pope	3
Epistles	4
Liturgical reforms	5
Charities	6
Political conduct	*ib.*
Administration of the Church	7
Controversy with John the Faster	8
Relations with the emperors	10
Theodelinda	12
Treatment of Sectaries and Jews	13
Exertions against paganism	14
Mission to England	*ib.*
Augustine and the Britons	19
Death of Augustine	20
Gregory's works and opinions	21
His death	25
Columban	*ib.*
Gall	29

CHAPTER II.

MAHOMET—THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY, A.D. 610—718.

Heraclius	30
Religious condition of Arabia	31
Mahomet	32
Progress of Mahometanism	35
Monothelism	37
Ecthesis of Heraclius	40
Pyrrhus and Maximus	41
Type of Constans	42
First Lateran Council	43
Persecution of Martin and Maximus	44
Council under Agatho	46
Sixth General Council	47
Council "in Trullo"	50
Justinian II.	51
Philippicus	53
The Maronites	54

CHAPTER III.

THE WESTERN CHURCH FROM THE DEATH OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY II., A.D. 604—715.

I. The Papacy	55
II. Spain	57
III. France	58
IV. England	61
Roman and Scottish usages	*ib.*
Conference at Whitby	64
Wilfrid—Theodore	65
Arts and learning	69
Monasticism	70
Bede, Aldhelm, Cædmon	71
V. Bavaria	72
Thuringia	73
Amandus	74
Livin—Eligius	75
Frisia—Wulfram—Egbert	76
Willibrord	77

CHAPTER IV.

ICONOCLASM, A.D. 717—775.

	Page		Page
Growth of reverence for images	79	Constantine Copronymus	89
Leo the Isaurian	80	Council at Constantinople	91
Germanus—"the Surety"	83	Persecution of monks	92
John of Damascus	84	The patriarch Constantine	93
Commotions in Italy	86	Death of Copronymus	94

CHAPTER V.

ST. BONIFACE, A.D. 716—755.

English missions to Germany	95	Charles Martel	100
Boniface	*ib.*	Councils	101
Labours in Frisia and Hessia	96	Fulda	102
Consecration at Rome	97	Adelbert and Clement	103
Daniel of Winchester	98	Virgil of Salzburg	105
The oak of Geismar	99	Archbishoprick of Mentz	106
Labours in Bavaria	*ib.*	Martyrdom of Boniface	108

CHAPTER VI.

PIPIN AND CHARLEMAGNE, A.D. 741—814.

Gregory III. and Charles Martel	113	Wars with the Saxons	127
Change of dynasty in France	114	Measures for conversion of the heathen	130
Stephen II. and the Lombards	116	Encouragement of learning	132
Pipin in Italy	117	Alcuin	133
Intrusion and deposition of pope Constantine	119	Education	135
Charlemagne's Lombard marriage	120	Service of the Church	137
End of the Lombard kingdom	121	Ecclesiastical legislation	138
Leo III.	122	Charlemagne and the papacy	139
Charlemagne emperor	124		

CHAPTER VII.

THE EASTERN CHURCH; CONTROVERSIES OF CHARLEMAGNE'S AGE, A.D. 775—814.

I. Leo IV.	140	II. Frankish doctrine as to images	150
Irene	141	The Caroline Books	*ib.*
Second Council of Nicæa	143	Council of Frankfort	153
Constantine VI.	147	III. Adoptionism	154
Nicephorus	148	IV. Controversy as to Procession of the Holy Spirit	160
Michael Rhangabe	149		

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORIENTAL SECTS.

I. Monophysites	163	III. Paulicians	164
II. Nestorians—Missions	*ib.*		

CHAPTER IX.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

Page

I. *Influence of the Papacy* 174
Donation of Constantine .. .. .. *ib.*
Roman influence in England 175
II. *Relations of Church and State* .. 177
(1.) Confirmation of popes .. .. *ib.*
(2.) Appointment of bishops .. .. *ib.*
(3.) Frankish archchaplains 179
(4.) Councils 180
(5.) Judicature .. .. *ib.*
III. *The Hierarchy—Administration of the Church* 182
(1.) Metropolitans .. .. *ib.*
(2.) Chorepiscopi .. .. *ib.*
(3.) Archdeacons 183
(4.) Archpriests—Rural Deaneries 184
(5.) Episcopal visitations .. .. .. *ib.*
(6.) Parishes 185
(7.) Local ties of clergy .. .. .. *ib.*
(8.) Acephalous clerks 186
(9.) Chaplains .. .. *ib.*
(10.) Advocates 187
(11.) Patronage 188
(12.) Simony 189
(13.) Precarious contracts 190
(14.) Tithes .. .. *ib.*
(15.) Benefices 192
(16.) Division of income .. .. .. *ib.*

Page

(17.) Taxation 194
(18.) Secular employments .. .. *ib.*
(19.) Position and manners of the clergy .. .. *ib.*
(20.) Celibacy 196
(21.) Canonical life 198
IV. *Monasticism* 201
Benedict of Aniane 207
Decay of English Monasticism .. 208
Nunneries 209
Canonesses 210
V. *Rites and Usages* .. .. *ib.*
(1.) Language of Divine service .. *ib.*
(2.) Organs 212
(3.) The Eucharist .. .. *ib.*
Purgatory—Masses 214
(4.) The Lord's-day 215
(5.) Other festivals 216
(6.) Reverence for saints 217
Relics 218
Legends 220
(7.) Pilgrimages 221
(8.) Penitential discipline 222
(9.) Ordeal 224
(10.) Asylum 227
VI. *Slavery* 228

BOOK II.

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THE COUNCIL OF SUTRI, A.D. 814—1046.

CHAPTER I.

LOUIS THE PIOUS, A.D. 814—840; END OF THE CONTROVERSY AS TO IMAGES, A.D. 813—842; THE FALSE DECRETALS.

I. Death of Charlemagne 233
Louis the Pious 234
Transactions with Leo III. and Stephen IV. 235
Ecclesiastical and monastic reform 236
Lothair associated in the empire .. 237
Conspiracy and death of Bernard .. 238
Marriage of Louis with Judith .. 239
Penance at Attigny .. .. *ib.*
Lothair at Rome 240
Intrigues against Louis 241
The Field of Lies 244
Deposition and restoration of Louis 245
His death 247
Northmen and Saracens 247
II. Images in the East .. .. *ib.*
Leo the Armenian 248
Theodore the Studite 249
Proceedings against images 251
Murder of Leo 254
Michael the Stammerer 255
Theophilus 257
Images restored by Theodora 260
III. Images in France 261
Agobard 263
Claudius of Turin 264
Change in the Frankish view 267
IV. The False Decretals .. .. .. *ib.*

CHAPTER II.

THE FRANKISH CHURCH AND THE PAPACY FROM THE DEATH OF LOUIS THE PIOUS TO THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT, A.D. 840—887.

	Page
Dismemberment of the empire	273
The Northmen	275
The Saracens	277
Diminution of the royal power	278
The Hierarchy	279
Hincmar	280
The Papacy	281
Nicolas I.	283
Doctrinal controversies	285
I. The Eucharistic presence	*ib.*
Paschasius Radbert	*ib.*
Ratramn	287
II. Predestination	288
Gottschalck	*ib.*
John Scotus	293
Controversy as to "Trina Deitas"	297
Captivity and death of Gottschalck	298
Questions between Rome and France	300
I. Lothair's marriage and divorce	*ib.*
Synod of Metz	303
Louis II. at Rome	304
Gunther and Theutgaud	*ib.*
Submission of Lothair	305
Adrian II.	307
Death of Lothair	310
II. Case of clerks ordained by Ebbo	*ib.*
III. Case of Rothad of Soissons	314
IV. Seizure of Lotharingia by Charles the Bald	319
V. Case of Hincmar of Laon	320
John VIII.	326
Charles the Bald, emperor	*ib.*
Council of Pontyon	327
Last expedition and death of Charles	329
John VIII. at Troyes	330
Charles the Fat	332

CHAPTER III.

THE GREEK CHURCH; PHOTIUS, A.D. 842—898.

	Page
Michael III.	333
Differences of Greeks and Latins	334
Deprivation of Ignatius	335
Photius	336
Conversion of Bulgaria	343
Basil the Macedonian	347
Photius deposed	348
Frankish writings against the Greeks	*ib.*
Eighth General Council of the Latins	349
Disputes as to Bulgaria	350
Photius in captivity	351
His restoration	352
Eighth General Council of the Greeks	353
Photius again deprived	354

CHAPTER IV.

SPAIN—ENGLAND—MISSIONS OF THE NINTH CENTURY.

	Page
I. Spain	356
Persecution at Cordova	357
II. England - The Danes	360
Alfred	*ib.*
III. Moravia - Cyril and Methodius	361
Bohemia	365
IV. Christianity in the North	366
Anskar	367
Anskar in Denmark and Sweden	368
Archbishopriek of Hamburg	370
Further labours of Anskar	371
Rimbert	375

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT TO THE DEATH OF POPE SYLVESTER II., A.D. 887—1003.

	Page
Character of the tenth century	376
Fourth marriage of Leo VI.	*ib.*
The Greek Church	377
Arnulph	378
Hungarians and Saracens	378
Germany	380
France—Normandy	381
Italy	383

CHAPTER V.—*continued.*

	Page
The Church in France	383
Degradation of the Papacy	384
Deposition of John XII.	389
Crescentius	391
Gregory V.	392
Arnulph of Rheims	394
Gerbert	396
Question as to marriage of Robert I.	400
Expectation of the second Advent	402
Gerbert pope (Sylvester II.)	403
Last days and death of Otho III.	405
Death of Sylvester	407

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE DEATH OF POPE SYLVESTER II. TO THE COUNCIL OF SUTRI, A.D. 1003—1046.

I. Henry II. emperor	408
State of Rome	409
The Normans in Italy	410
Conrad II.	412
Benedict IX.	413
Heribert of Milan	*ib.*
Death of Conrad	414
Three popes	415
Council of Sutri	416
II. Heresy in the West	417
Sect at Orleans	418
Sect at Arras	420
Sect at Monteforte	421
Sect at Châlons	422
Question as to origin of the sects	*ib.*
Heresies of the East	424

CHAPTER VII.

THE BRITISH CHURCHES—MISSIONS OF THE TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES.

I. England	425
Dunstan	426
II. Ireland	429
III. Scotland	431
IV. Russia	432
V. Bohemia	435
Adalbert of Prague	436
VI. Slavonic Liturgy	438
VII. Poland	439
VIII. North Germany	440
IX. Hungary	441
X. Denmark	444
XI. Sweden	446
XII. Norway	447
Olave Tryggvesen	449
St. Olave	452
XIII. Iceland	454
XIV. Greenland and America	456

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. *The Hierarchy*	459
(1.) The Papacy	*ib.*
Metropolitans—The pall	462
Legates	463
Interference with diocesan rights	464
(2.) Secular importance of bishops	465
Appointment to sees	466
Theophylact of Constantinople	468
Simony	*ib.*
Investiture	469
Relations of bishops and sovereigns	470
Foundation of sees	472
Chorepiscopi	*ib.*
Coadjutors	473
Warlike bishops	*ib.*
(3.) Property of the Church	*ib.*
Advocates	475
(4.) Canons	476
(5.) Morals of the clergy	477
Chaplains and acephalous clerks	*ib.*
Celibacy and marriage	478
Ratherius	480
II. *Monasticism*	482
Order of Cluny	484
Order of Camaldoli	488
Order of Vallombrosa	*ib.*
Reforms in Germany—Hirschau	489
Abolition of impropriations	490
Relations of bishops and monks	*ib.*
Confraters	492
III. *Rites and Usages*	493
(1.) Ritualists	*ib.*
(2.) Martyrologies and legends	494
Canonisation	496
(3.) Reverence for the Blessed Virgin	*ib.*
(4.) All Souls' Day	497
(5.) Relics	498
(6.) Pilgrimages	499
(7.) Architecture	500
(8.) Penance	501
(9.) Truce of God	503
IV. *Chivalry*	506

BOOK III.

FROM THE COUNCIL OF SUTRI TO THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS, A.D. 1046—1122.

CHAPTER I.

THE PONTIFICATES OF CLEMENT II., DAMASUS II., LEO IX., VICTOR II., STEPHEN IX., NICOLAS II., AND ALEXANDER II., A.D. 1046—1073.

	Page
Clement II.	509
Conflicting views as to Reform	510
Damasus II.	512
Hildebrand	513
Leo IX.	514
Peter Damiani	515
Dominic of the Cuirass	517
Council of Rheims	520
Leo at Worms	524
Leo and the Normans	525
His death	526
Breach with Constantinople	527
Victor II.	531
Stephen IX.	532
John of Velletri	535
Nicolas II.	*ib.*
Decree as to election of popes	536
Treaty with Robert Guiscard	538
Norman conquests in Italy and Sicily	539
Troubles at Milan	540
Legation of Peter Damiani	543
Death of Nicolas	545
Alexander II. and Cadalous	546
Abduction of Henry IV.	547
Synod of Osbor	548
Peter Damiani in retirement	549
Adalbert of Bremen	550
Council of Mantua	554
Renewed troubles at Milan	*ib.*
Troubles at Florence	558
Henry IV. and Bertha	559
Last days and death of Adalbert	560
Disorders of Germany	561
Deaths of Alexander and Damiani	563

CHAPTER II.

GREGORY VII., A.D. 1073—1085.

Election of Hildebrand as pope	564
Claims of the Papacy	566
Gregory and Philip I.	568
Transactions with Germany	569
Measures against simony and marriage	572
Investiture	575
Seizure of Gregory by Cencius	576
Communications between Gregory and Henry	578
Council at Worms	579
Excommunication of Henry	581
Excommunication of Gregory	*ib.*
Distress of Henry	582
Meeting at Tribur	583
Henry goes into Italy	584
Gregory and Henry at Canossa	586
Henry and the Italians	589
Election of Rudolph	591
War in Germany	592
Remonstrances of the Saxons	593
Henry again excommunicated	594
Guibert elected antipope	595
Gregory's preparations against Henry	*ib.*
Henry in Italy	598
The Normans at Rome	600
Death and character of Gregory	601

CHAPTER III.

BERENGAR, A.D. 1045—1088.

Doctrine of the Eucharistic presence	606
Berengar	607
Lanfranc	608
Letter of Berengar to Lanfranc	609
Councils at Rome, Vercelli, Brionne, and Paris	610
Council at Tours	612
Berengar before Nicolas II.	613
Treatises of Lanfranc and Berengar	614
Guitmund	616
Roman council of 1079	617
Last years of Berengar	618

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF GREGORY VII. TO THAT OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV.; THE FIRST CRUSADE, A.D. 1085—1106.

	Page
Victor III.	619
Urban II.	621
Second marriage of Matilda	623
Henry in Italy	*ib.*
Rebellion of Conrad	624
Sufferings of Christians in Palestine	625
Peter the Hermit	626
Councils of Piacenza and Clermont	627
Preparations for the Crusade	631
The first expeditions	633
Leaders of the regular forces	635
The Crusaders at Constantinople	636
Passage through Asia Minor	637
Siege of Antioch	*ib.*
Siege of Jerusalem	640
Kingdom of Jerusalem	641
Results of the crusades	643
The Sicilian monarchy	647
Deaths of Urban, Guibert, and Philip I.	648
Henry IV. in Germany	649
Rebellion of the younger Henry	651
Abdication and death of Henry IV.	652

CHAPTER V.

ENGLAND FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE DEATH OF ST. ANSELM, A.D. 1066—1108.

	Page
Effects of the Conquest	656
Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury	658
Ecclesiastical policy of the Conqueror	659
Communications with Gregory VII.	661
William Rufus	662
Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury	663
Disagreements between William and Anselm	667
Council of Rockingham	669
Acknowledgment of Urban	670
Anselm goes to Rome	671
Exile and recall of Anselm	673
Question of homage	*ib.*
Second exile	676
Reconciliation with Henry I.	678
Death of Anselm	679

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV. TO THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS, A.D. 1106—1122.

	Page
Council of Guastalla	680
Conferences at Châlons and Troyes	681
Henry V. in Italy	*ib.*
Seizure and submission of Paschal II.	683
Movements of the Hildebrandine party	685
Henry in Germany	686
His second expedition to Italy	687
Gelasius II., pope; Gregory VIII., antipope	688
Calixtus II.	690
Council of Rheims	*ib.*
Conference with Henry I. at Gisors	692
Punishment of the antipope	694
Dispositions towards peace	*ib.*
Concordat of Worms	695

CHAPTER VII.

MONASTICISM—NEW ORDERS—THE TEMPLARS AND HOSPITALLERS.

	Page
State of Monasticism	698
New orders: —	
I. Order of Grammont	699
II. Carthusians	702
III. Order of Fontevraud	704
IV. Cistercians	706
V. Canons regular of St. Augustine	708
Præmonstratensians	709
VI. Canons of St. Antony	712
Templars and Hospitallers	*ib.*
Increased power of monachism	715

INDEX | 718

LIST OF BOOKS REFERRED TO.

[*This list is supplementary to that given in the former volume, and is limited to such works as are cited throughout some considerable portion of the following pages. Books which are quoted in particular sections only will be found described in the proper places.*]

Agobardus, ed. Baluze, Paris, 1666.
Alcuinus, ed. Froben. Ratisbon, 1777.
Alexander, Natalis, Hist. Ecclesiastica, Bingæ, 1788.
Ampère, Littérature Française au Moyen Age, Paris, 1841.
Anastasius, Vitæ Roman. Pontificum, in Muratori, t. iii.
Anselmus, ed. Gerberon, Paris, 1721.
Bähr, Christlich-römische Litteratur, Carlsr. 1840.
Bayle, Dictionnaire, Paris, 1820.
Bibliotheca Patrum, Lugduni, 1677.
Bonizo, in Oefelii Rerum Boicarum Scriptores, t. ii. Aug. Vind. 1763.
Bouquet, *see* Recueil.
Bowden, Life of Gregory VII., Lond. 1841.
Canisius, Lectiones Antiquæ, ed. Basnage, Amst. 1725.
Cedrenus, in Hist. Byzant. Scriptores, ed. Paris, 1648.
Dahlmann, Gesch. v. Dännemarck, Hamb. 1840, seqq.
Depping, Expéditions Maritimes des Normands, Paris, 1826.
Dodechini Annales, in Pistorii Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores, t. 1, Ratisb. 1726.
Döllinger, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Regensb. 1843.
Ducange, Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis, Paris, 1840-6.
Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, London, 1845.
Ebrard, Das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl, Frankf. 1844-6.
Eccardi Corpus Historicum Medii Ævi, Lips. 1723.
Einhardus, ed. Teulet, Paris, 1840.
Ellendorf, Die Karolinger und die Hierarchie ihrer Zeit, Essen, 1838.
Finlay, Hist. of the Greek and Byzantine Empires, Edinb. 1844, seqq.
Florentius Wigorniensis, ed. Thorpe (English Historical Society).
Geijer, Geschichte Schwedens, übers. v. Leffler, Hamb. 1832, seqq.
Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte, B. ii. ed. 4, Bonn, 1846-8; B. vi. (Dogmengeschichte), 1855.
Gfrörer Kirchengeschichte (to A.D. 1056), Stuttg. 1841-6.
——— Gesch. der Karolinger, A.D. 840-918, Freiburg, 1848. [For the period which it includes, this is intended when the author's name only is given.]
Giannone, Istoria di Napoli, Italia, 1821.
Goldasti Imperialia Decreta de Cultu Imaginum, Francof. 1608.
——— Apologia pro Henrico IV., Hanov. 1611.
Gregorius Magnus, ed. Migne, Paris, 1849.
Guéranger, Institutions Liturgiques, tt. i.-ii., Paris, 1840-1.
Hahn, Gesch. der Ketzer im Mittelalter, Stuttg. 1845-7.
Haurćau, De la Philosophie Scholastique, Paris, 1850.
Hélyot, Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, Paris, 1714-9.
Hincmarus, Paris, 1645.
Histoire Littéraire de la France, par les Bénédictins de S. Maur, Paris, 1733, seqq.
Höller, Die Deutschen Päpste, Regensb. 1839, seqq.
Inett, Origines Anglicanæ, Oxford, 1710.
Jaffé, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, Berol. 1851. [This has been usually followed in dates relating to the popes.]
Johnson, Laws and Canons of the Church of England, ed. Baron, Oxf. 1850-1.
Kemble, The Saxons in England, Lond. 1849.
King, Primer of the Hist. of the Church in Ireland, Dubl. 1845-51.

Lappenberg, Geschichte von England, i.-ii., Hamb. 1834-7. [For the first volume, the translation by Thorpe, Lond. 1846, has been generally used.]
Mabillon, Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, Paris, 1668-1701.
——— Annales, tt. v. vi., Paris, 1713-39.
Mailáth, Gesch. der Magyaren, Wien, 1828.
Marca (De), De Concordantia Sacerdotii et Imperii, Paris, 1663.
Mariana, Historia general de España, Madr. 1817, seqq.
Martene, De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, Venet. 1783.
Martin, Hist. de France, Paris, 1850-1.
Michaud, Hist. des Croisades, Brux. 1841.
Michelet, Hist. de France, Brux. 1841.
Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, Lond. 1854-6.
Mouravieff, Hist. of the Russian Church, transl. by Blackmore, Oxf. 1842.
Münter, Kirchengesch. von Dännemarck u. Norwegen, Leipz. 1825, seqq.
Muratori, Italicarum Rerum Scriptores, Mediol. 1723, seqq.
Ordericus Vitalis, ed. Le Prevost, Paris, 1838, seqq.
Ozanam, La Civilisation Chrétienne chez les Francs, Paris, 1849.
Palacky, Gesch. von Böhmen, Prag. 1845, seqq.
Palgrave, Hist of Normandy and of England, Lond. 1851, seqq.
Pertz, Monumenta Germaniæ Historica, Hanov. 1826, seqq. [In two divisions—*Scriptores* and *Leges*. An alphabetical list of contents is given in vol. xii. of the Scriptores.]
Petrus Damiani, ed. Cajetan., Paris, 1663
Raumer (F. v.), Gesch. der Hohenstaufen und ihrer Zeit, Leipz. 1823, seqq.
Recueil des Historiens de la France (Gallicarum et Francicarum Rerum Scriptores), Paris, 1738, seqq. [This is usually cited under the name of the first editor, Bouquet.]
Rettberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands (to A.D. 814), Götting. 1846-8.
Savile, Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores, Lond. 1596.
Schlosser, Gesch. der bilderstürmenden Kaiser, Frankf. 1812.
Sismondi, Hist. des Républiques Italiennes, Brux. 1826.
Snorro Sturleson, Hist. of the Kings of Norway, transl. by Laing, London, 1844.
Soames, the Anglo-Saxon Church, ed. 2.
Stenzel, Deutschland unter den Fränkischen Kaisern, Leipz. 1828.
Stevenson, Church Historians of England, Lond. (now in course of publication).
Strahl, Gesch. des Russischen Staats, Ham. 1832, seqq.
Symeon Dunelmensis, in Twysden.
Theodorus Studita, in Sirmondi Opera Varia, t. v. Venet. 1728.
Theophanes, ed. Classen, Bonn, 1839-41.
Thierry, Hist. de la Conquête d'Angleterre par les Normands, Brux. 1835.
Thomassini Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina, Neapol. 1770, seqq.
Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, folio edition.
Turner, Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons, ed. 6, Lond. 1836.
Urstisii Germaniæ Historici Illustres, Francof. 1585.
Voigt, Hildebrand und sein Zeitalter, ed. 2, Weimar, 1846.
Wendover, Roger, ed. Coxe. (Eng. Hist. Soc.)
Wharton, Anglia Sacra, Lond. 1691.
Wilken, Gesch. der Kreuzzüge, Leipz. 1807, seqq.
Wilkins, Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, Lond. 1737.
Will. Malmesburiensis, Gesta Regum, ed. Hardy (Eng. Hist. Soc.). [When the author's name only is given, this work is intended.]
——— Gesta Pontificum, in Savile.

A HISTORY

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK I.

FROM THE ELECTION OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE, A.D. 590–814.

CHAPTER I.

GREGORY THE GREAT, A.D. 590–604.—COLUMBAN, A.D. 589–615.

The end of the sixth century may be regarded as the boundary between early and mediæval Church-History. The scene of interest is henceforth varied; the eastern churches, oppressed by calamities and inwardly decaying, will claim but little of our attention, while it will be largely engaged by regions of the West, unnoticed, or but slightly noticed, in earlier times. The Gospel will be seen penetrating the barbarian tribes which had overrun the western empire, bringing to them not only religious truth but the elements of culture and refinement adapting itself to them, moulding them, and experiencing their influence in return. As Christianity had before been affected by the ideas and by the practices of its Greek and Roman converts, so it now suffered among the barbarians, although rather from the rudeness of their manners than from the infection of their old religions. Yet throughout the dreariest of the ages which lie before us, we may discern the gracious providence of God, preserving the essentials of the truth in the midst of ignorance and corruptions, enabling men to overcome the evil influences by which they were surrounded, and filling the hearts of multitudes with zeal not only to extend the visible bounds of Christ's kingdom, but also to enforce the power of faith on those who were already professedly His subjects.

Gregory, the most eminent representative of the transition from the early to the middle period, was born at Rome about the year 540.[a] His family was of senatorial rank; he was a great-grandson of a pope named Felix—either the third or the fourth of that name.[b] Gregory entered into civil employment, and attained the office of prætor of the city; but about the age of thirty-five[c] he abandoned the pursuit of worldly distinctions, and employed his wealth in founding seven monasteries—six of them in Sicily, and the other, which was dedicated to St. Andrew, in his family mansion at Rome.[d] In this Roman monastery he took up his abode, and entered on a strictly ascetic life, in which he persevered notwithstanding the frequent and severe illness which his austerities produced.[e] About the year 577, he was ordained deacon, and was appointed to exercise his office in one of the seven principal churches of the city;[f] and in 578, or the following year, he was sent by Pelagius II. as his representative to the court of Tiberius, who had lately become sole emperor on the death of the younger Justin.[g] The most noted incident of his residence at Constantinople was a controversy with the patriarch Eutychius, who maintained the opinion of Origen, that the "spiritual body" of the saints after the resurrection would be impalpable, and more subtle than wind or air. Gregory on the contrary held, according to the doctrine which had been recommended to the western church by the authority of Augustine,[h] that if the body were impalpable its identity would be lost; it will, he said, be "palpable in the reality of its nature, although subtle by the effect of spiritual grace." Tiberius ordered a book in which Eutychius had maintained his opinion to be burnt; and the patriarch soon after, on his death-bed, avowed himself a convert to the opposite view, by laying hold of his attenuated arm and declaring, "I confess that in this flesh we shall all rise again."[i]

A.D. 582.

After his return to Rome,[k] Gregory was elected abbot of his

[a] Lau, Gregor der Grosse, 10. Leipz., 1845.

[b] The *third*, according to Gregory's biographer Paul. c. 1; Baronius, 492. 1; 581. 4; and Lau, 9; the *fourth*, according to John the Deacon, i. 1; the Benedictine biographer, Ste. Marthe, i. 3; and Fleury, xxxiv. 35.

[c] For the date see Pagi, x. 363; Lau, 71.

[d] Paul, 4; Sammarth. ii. 6; Lau, 120-1.

[e] Paul, 5. Ste. Marthe (Vita, i. 3) and Mabillon (Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. I., xxxix.) claim him as a member of the Benedictine Order; but it seems more than doubtful (Pagi, x. 368; Schröckh, xvii. 245). On this depends another question—whether Augustine and his companions in the English mission were Benedictines. See Sammarth. iii. 6-7; Mabill., I. xl. seqq.; Thomassin, I. iii. 24.

[f] Paul, 7; Lau, 25.

[g] A.D. 578. He had been associated in the empire four years before.—Gibbon, iv. 253-4.

[h] Giesceler, vi. 427.

[i] Greg. Moralia, xiv. 56.

[k] A.D. 584. Pagi, x. 368, 585; Lau,

monastery, and also acted as ecclesiastical secretary to Pelagius.[m] On the death of that pope, who was carried off by a plague in January, 590,[n] he was chosen by the senate, the clergy, and the people to fill the vacant chair. He endeavoured by various means to escape the elevation; but the letter, in which he entreated the emperor Maurice to withhold his consent,[o] was opened and detained by the governor of Rome; miracles baffled his attempts to conceal himself; and he was consecrated in September, 590.[p]

The position which Gregory had now attained was one from which he might well have shrunk, for other reasons than the fear ascribed to him by an ancient biographer, "lest the worldly glory which he had before cast away might creep on him under the colour of ecclesiastical government."[q] He compares his church to an "old and violently-shattered ship, admitting the waters on all sides, —its timbers rotten, shaken by daily storms, and sounding of wreck."[r] The north of Italy was overrun, and its other provinces were threatened, by the Lombards. The distant sovereignty of Constantinople, instead of protecting its Italian subjects, acted only as a hindrance to their exerting themselves for their own defence. The local authorities had neither courage to make war nor wisdom to negotiate; some of them, by their unprincipled exactions, even drove their people to espouse the interest of the enemy.[s] The inhabitants had been wasted by war, famine, and disease, while the rage for celibacy had contributed to prevent the recruiting of their numbers. The depopulated soil had in many places become pestilential. The supplies of corn, which had formerly been drawn from Sicily to support the excess of population, were now rendered necessary by the general abandonment of husbandry. Rome itself had suffered from storms and inundations, in addition to the common misfortunes of the country. The miseries of the time were such as to produce in religious minds the conviction, which Gregory often expresses, that the end of the world was at hand.[t] Nor was the aspect of ecclesiastical affairs more cheering. The clergy were few and inadequate to the pastoral superintendence of their scattered flocks; among them and among

30, 586; Dupin, v. 102. Dean Milman thinks that he was abbot before his mission to Constantinople, i. 432.

[m] Sammarth. I., vi. 1. [n] Jaffé, 91.

[o] For the necessity of the emperor's consent, see vol. i. p. 501, and Baron. 540. 10.

[p] Paul, 13; Greg. Turon. x. i.; Pagi, x. 489; Lau, 37-40. John the Deacon thinks it necessary to enter into a formal proof that Gregory's reluctance was real (i. 45)—a vindication of the man which reflects on the age.

[q] Paul, 10. [r] Ep. i. 4.

[s] Ep. v. 41.

[t] Baron. 590. 22-5; 594. 9; Sammarth. II., iv. 4; Gibbon, iv. 267-8; Neander, v. 155; Lau, 60.

the monks, the troubles of the age had produced a general decay of morals and discipline.[w] The formidable Lombards were Arians; the schism which had arisen out of the question as to the "Three Articles," continued to hold Istria and other provinces separate from Rome, and had many adherents in Gaul.[x] In Gaul, too, the Church was oppressed by the extreme depravity of the princes and nobles, and by the general barbarism of the clergy as well as of the people. Spain had just been recovered from Arianism, but much was yet wanting to complete and assure the victory. In Africa, the old sect of Donatists took occasion from the prevailing confusions to lift up its head once more, and to commit aggressions on the Church. The eastern patriarchates were distracted by the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies; a patriarch of Antioch had been deprived, and the bishop of Rome had reason to look with jealousy on his brother and rival of the newer capital.

The collection of Gregory's letters, nearly eight hundred and fifty in number, exhibits a remarkable picture of his extensive and manifold activity. And it is in this that their value mainly consists; for, although questions of theology and morality are sometimes treated in them, they do not contain those elaborate discussions which are found among the correspondence of Jerome and Augustine.[y] Gregory had neither leisure nor inclination for such discussions; but his capacity for business, his wide, various, and minute supervision, his combination of tenacity and dexterity in the conduct of affairs, are truly wonderful. From treating with patriarchs, kings, or emperors on the highest concerns of Church or state, he passes to direct the management of a farm, the reclaiming of a runaway nun,[z] or the relief of a distressed petitioner in some distant dependency of his see. He appears as a pope, as a virtual sovereign, as a bishop, as a landlord.[a] He takes measures for the defence of his country, for the conversion of the heathen, for the repression and reconciliation of sectaries and schismatics; he administers discipline, manages the care of vacant dioceses, arranges for the union of sees where impoverishment and depopulation rendered such a junction expedient, directs

[w] Lau, 48, 111.

[x] Lau, 143. See vol. i. p. 484.

[y] Dupin (v. 104, seqq.) gives a summary of the chief points in Gregory's letters, classed under separate heads. Jaffé, in his elaborate and valuable 'Regesta,' gives an analysis of them, arranged in chronological order.

[z] Epp. viii. 8-9; ix. 114.

[a] See Gibbon, iv. 370-1; Schröckh, xvii. 278-80; Neander, v. 156. For his humane care to lessen the burdens and oppressions of his *coloni*, see Savigny in the Philological Museum, ii. 129-131. Cambridge, 1833.

the election of bishops, and superintends the performance of their duties. He intercedes with the great men of the earth for those who suffered from the conduct of their subordinates; he mediates in quarrels between bishops and their clergy, or between clergy and laity; he advises on the temporal concerns of churches, and in a spirit of disinterestedness and equity very unlike the grasping conduct of too many bishops where legacies or other property were in question. In his letters to the emperors, although the tone is humble and submissive, he steadily holds to his purpose, and opposes everything which he regards as an encroachment on the Church.[b]

Gregory lived in a simple[c] and monastic style, confining his society to monks and clergy, with whom he carried on his studies.[d] He endeavoured to provide for the education of the clergy, not indeed according to any exalted literary standard, but in such a manner as the circumstances of his time allowed. He introduced a new and more effective organization into his Church.[e] He laboured for the improvement of the liturgy, and gave to the canon of the mass the form which it still retains in all essential respects.[f] He instituted a singing-school, selected music, and established the manner of chanting which derives its name from him.[g] He superintended in person the exercises of the choristers; the whip with which he threatened and admonished them was preserved for centuries as a relic.[h] The misconduct of persons who on account of their vocal powers had been ordained deacons had become scandalous; Gregory, with a council, attempted to remedy the evil, not by requiring a greater strictness of behaviour in the singers, but by enacting that the chanting should be performed by subdeacons or clerks of the inferior orders.[i] He laboured diligently

[b] Lau, 105-6.

[c] One of his epistles (ii. 32), addressed to an agent in Sicily, has been often quoted as showing both Gregory's humour and the humbleness of his establishment: "You have sent us," he writes, "one wretched horse and five good asses. I cannot ride the horse, because he is wretched; nor the good beasts, because they are asses."

[d] Joh. Diac. ii. 11-2; Lau, 58.

[e] Lau, 303.

[f] See vol. iv. of his works; also Palmer's Origines, i. 111, seqq.; Guéranger, i. 162, seqq.; Lau, 244-299.

[g] Maimbourg, in Bayle, art. Grégoire, note O; Lau, 258.

[h] Joh. Diac. ii. 5-6. This writer's account of the manner in which the "Germans or Gauls" performed the Gregorian chant (ii. 7) is too curious to be omitted here, although it has been partly quoted by Gibbon: "Alpina siquidem corpora, vocum suarum tonitruis altisone perstrepentia, susceptæ modulationis dulcedinem proprie non resultant, quia bibuli gutturis barbara feritas, dum inflexionibus et repercussionibus mitem nititur edere cantilenam, naturali quedam fragore, quasi plaustra per gradus confuse sonantia, rigidas voces jactat, sicque audientium animos, quos mulcere debuerat, exasperando magis ac obstrependo contubat."

[i] Hardouin, iii. 196.

as a preacher, and it was believed that a white dove was seen to whisper into his ear as he preached.[k] When Rome was threatened in 595 by the Lombards under Agilulf, he expounded Ezekiel from the pulpit, until at length the pressure of distress obliged him to desist, finding that in such circumstances his mind was too much distracted to penetrate into the mysteries of the prophetic book.[m] "Let no one blame me," he says in the last homily of the series, "if after this discourse I cease, since, as you all see, our tribulations are multiplied: on every side we are surrounded with swords, on every side we fear the imminent peril of death. Some come back to us maimed of their hands, others are reported to be prisoners or slain. I am forced to withhold my tongue from exposition, for that my soul is weary of my life."[n] When obliged in his last years by sickness to withdraw from preaching in person, he dictated sermons which were delivered by others.[o]

The wealth of his see enabled Gregory to exercise extensive charities, which were administered according to a regulated scheme. On the first day of every month he distributed large quantities of provisions, and many members of the nobility were so reduced by the calamities of the age that they were glad to share in his bounty. Every day he sent alms to a number of needy persons, in all quarters of the city. When a poor man had been found dead in the street, he abstained from the celebration of the eucharist for some days, as considering himself to be the cause of his death. He was in the habit of sending dishes from his own table to persons whom he knew to be ashamed to ask relief. He entertained strangers and wanderers as his guests; and his biographers tell us that on one occasion he was rewarded by a vision, in which he was informed that among the objects of his hospitality had been his guardian angel. At another time, it is related, the Saviour appeared to him by night, and said to him, "On other days thou hast relieved me in my members, but yesterday in myself."[p]

Gregory found himself obliged to take an active part in political affairs. He desired peace, not only for its own sake, but as necessary for the reform and extension of the Church.[q] He laboured for it notwithstanding many discouragements, and notwithstanding repeated disappointments by the breach of truces which had been concluded. He took it upon himself to negotiate with the Lombards; and, although slighted and ridiculed by the

[k] Baron. 604. 20.
[m] Hom. in Ezech., præf. ad l. ii.
[n] II. x. 24.
[o] Schröckh, xvii. 281.
[p] Joh. Diac. ii. 22-30; Lau, 303.
[q] Lau, 54.

court of Constantinople for his endeavours, he found his comfort in their success, and in the gratitude of the people whom he had rescued from the miseries of war.[r]

The property of the Roman see, which had come to be designated as the "patrimony of St. Peter," included estates not only in Italy and the adjacent islands, but in Gaul, Illyria, Dalmatia, Africa, and even in Asia.[s] These estates were managed by commissioners chosen from the orders of deacons and subdeacons, or by laymen who had the title of *Defensors*. By agents of this class Gregory carried on much of the administration of his own patriarchate and of his communications with other churches; and, in addition to these, he was represented by *vicars*—bishops on whom, either for the eminence of their sees or for their personal merits, he bestowed certain prerogatives and jurisdiction, of which the *pall* was the badge.[t] His more especial care was limited to the "suburbicarian" provinces, and beyond these he did not venture to interfere in the internal concerns of churches.[u] In Gaul and in Spain he had vicars: his superintendence over the churches of these countries was undefined, and was chiefly exercised in the shape of exhortations to their sovereigns; but he succeeded in establishing by this means a closer connexion with the Frankish kingdom than that which had before existed; and by thus strengthening his interest in the West, he provided for his Church a support independent of the power of Constantinople.[x]

By the aid of Gennadius, governor of Africa, he acquired a degree of authority before unknown over the Church of that country.[y] In his dealings with the bishops of the west, he upheld the authority of St. Peter's chair as the source of all ecclesiastical privileges—the centre of jurisdiction, to which all ecclesiastical causes ought to be referred as the highest tribunal.[z] His agents, although belonging to the lower grades of the ministry, were virtually the chief ecclesiastical authorities within their spheres. We find subdeacons invested with this office commissioned not only to admonish individual bishops, but even to convoke those of a whole province, to administer the papal rebuke to them, and to report

[r] Sammarth. ii. 2; iv. 1; Gibbon, iv. 274; Lau, 63-6, 138-142.

[s] Baron. 591. 30: Giannone, l. IV. xi. 1; Lau, 50.

[t] See Epp. iii. 56-7; v. 11, 15, 53; vi. 34, 62, &c. The emperor's consent was necessary before the pall could be bestowed on any bishops who were not his subjects. (Ep. ix. 11; Giesseler, I. ii. 416; Lau, 95.) On its form see n. on Ep. i. 28; De Marca, l. vi. c. 6; Lau, 54.

[u] Fleury, xxxv. 19; Dupin, v. 103.

[x] Lau, 89, 179; Neander, v. 162; Rettberg, ii. 583.

[y] Lau, 103-4, 209.

[z] Neander, v. 156; Lau, 53, 96-100.

them to the apostolical chair in case of neglect.[a] In some cases, however, where the agents exceeded their general authority, and allowed causes to be carried before them without reference to the diocesan, Gregory admonished them to respect the rights of the episcopate.[b] With this lofty conception of the authority of his see, it would appear that he was unfeignedly free from personal pride and assumption; but he must be reckoned among those of the popes who have laboured most effectively for the extension of the papal dominion.

Gregory always treated the eastern patriarchs as independent. He spoke of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch as his equals; as being, like himself, successors of St. Peter, and sharers with him in the one chair of the same founder.[c] With the bishops of Constantinople he had serious differences; but these arose, not from any claim on the Roman side, but from a supposed assumption on the part of Constantinople.[d] John, styled for his ascetic life *the Faster*, was raised to the patriarchate of the eastern capital in 585. He resisted the elevation with a great appearance of resolution, and Gregory at the time admired him for his humility, although he afterwards came to regard it as the mask of pride.[e] In 587 a great synod of eastern bishops and senators was held at Constantinople for the trial of certain charges against Gregory, patriarch of Antioch.[f] John presided, in virtue of the position assigned to his see by the second and fourth General Councils; and in the Acts he assumed, like some of his predecessors,[g] the title of "Ecumenical (which the Latins rendered by *Universal*) Bishop." The meaning of this term, in Byzantine usage, was indefinite; there was certainly no intention of claiming by it a jurisdiction over the whole Church;[h] but

[a] Epp. xiii. 26-7; Lau, 112.

[b] Ep. xi. 37.

[c] Epp. vi. 60; vii. 40.

[d] In one of his epistles (ix. 12), when meeting a charge of having adopted some ritual novelties from Constantinople, he asks: "As for the Constantinopolitan Church, who can doubt that it is *subjecta* to the Apostolic See, as both the most pious emperor and our brother the bishop of that city constantly allow?" Perhaps *subjecta* may mean *inferior*; for the whole course of Gregory's dealings with Constantinople is against the idea of his having regarded the patriarch as *subject* to him.

[e] Epp. v 18, 44

[f] Gregory was acquitted. The historian, Evagrius, who was a lawyer of Antioch, and attended him as his counsel, gives a very high character of him, v. 6; vi. 7.

[g] See vol. i. p. 497.

[h] Thomassin de Benef. I. i. 11-16; Dupin, v. 25. Compare the preface to the Acts of the Second Council of Nicæa, by Anastasius the librarian (Hard. iv. 20). "Cum apud Cpolim positus frequenter Græcos super hoc vocabulo reprehenderem, et fastus vel arrogantiæ redarguerem, asserebant quod non ideo *œcumenicum*, quem multi *universalem* interpretati sunt, dicerent patriarcham, quod universi orbis teneat præsulatum; sed quod cuidam parti præsit orbis quæ a Christianis inhabi-

Pelagius II., viewing with jealousy the power of Constantinople, and apprehensive of the additional importance which its bishops might derive from the presidency of a council assembled for so important a purpose, laid hold on the title as a pretext for disallowing the acts of the assembly, although they had been confirmed by the emperor, and forbade his envoy to communicate with John.

Gregory took up the question with great earnestness. After repeated but ineffectual remonstrances through his apocrisiary,[k] he wrote to the patriarch himself, to the emperor Maurice, and to the empress. To the emperor he urged that the title assumed by the patriarch interfered with the honour of the sovereign.[m] He declared that John was drawn by his flatterers into the use of the "proud and foolish" word; that the assumption was an imitation of the devil, who exalted himself above his brother angels; that it was unlike the conduct of St. Peter, who, although the first of the apostles, was but a member of the same class with the rest; that bishops ought to learn from the calamities of the time to employ themselves better than in claiming lofty designations; that, appearing now when the end of the world was at hand, it was a token of Antichrist's approach. The council of Chalcedon, he said,[n] had indeed given the title to the bishops of Rome, but they had never adopted it, lest they should seem to deny the pontificate to others.[o] Gregory also wrote to Eulogius of Alexandria, and to Anastasius of Antioch, endeavouring to enlist them in his cause.[p] To allow the title to John, he said, would be to derogate from their own rights, and a wrong to their whole order. "Ecumenical bishop" must mean sole bishop; if, therefore, the ecumenical bishop should err, the whole Church would fail; and for a patriarch of Constantinople to assume the proud and superstitious name, which was an invention of the first apostate, was alarming, since among the occupants of that see there had been not only heretics, but heresiarchs. Both the Egyptian and the Syrian patriarchs had reason to deprecate a rupture of the Church's peace, and to avoid any step which might provoke the emperor.[q] Anastasius had been expelled from

A.D. 594.

tatur. Nam quod Graeci *œcumenem* vocant, a Latinis non solum *orbis*, a cujus universitate *universalis* appellatur, verum etiam *habitatio* seu *locus habitabilis* nuncupatur."

[l] Greg. Epp. v. 18-44; Schröckh, xvi. 61.

[k] Lau, 149.

[m] Ep. v. 20.

[n] That this was a mistake, see vol. i. p. 497.

[o] Epp. v. 18, 20, 21; vi. 33.

[p] Epp. v. 43; vi. 60; vii. 27; ix. 78.

[q] Lau, 158.

his see by the younger Justin, and had not been restored until after an exclusion of thirteen years (A.D. 582-595), on the death of Gregory;[r] Eulogius was struggling with the difficulties of the Monophysite schism: while to both of them, as orientals, the title of ecumenical appeared neither a novelty nor so objectionable as the Roman bishop considered it. Eulogius, however, reported that he had ceased to use it in writing to John, as Gregory had directed (*sicut jussistis*), and in his letter he addressed the bishop of Rome himself as "universal pope." "I beg," replied Gregory, "that you would not speak of *directing*, since I know who I am, and who you are. In dignity you are my brother; in character, my father. . . . . I pray your most sweet holiness to address me no more with the proud appellation of 'universal pope,' since that which is given to another beyond what reason requires is subtracted from yourself. If you style me universal pope, you deny that you are at all that which you own me to be universally. Away with words which puff up vanity and wound charity!"[s]

John of Constantinople died in 590, leaving no other property than a small wooden bedstead, a shabby woollen coverlet, and a ragged cloak, relics which were removed to the imperial palace in reverence of the patriarch's sanctity.[t] His successor, Cyriac, continued to use the obnoxious title, but Gregory continued to remonstrate against it, and, although he received the announcement of Cyriac's elevation, forbade his envoys at Constantinople to communicate with the new patriarch so long as the style of ecumenical bishop should be retained.[u]

During his residence at Constantinople, Gregory had been on terms of great intimacy with Maurice, who at that time was in a private station. But since the elevation of the one to the empire, and of the other to St. Peter's chair, many causes of disagreement

[r] Evagr. v. 5; Dupin, v. 95.

[s] Ep. viii. 30. Baronius, after quoting some very insufficient cases of Gregory's interference in countries beyond his own patriarchate, exclaims—"Sic vides Gregorium, cum refugit dici universalis, universalis tamen ecclesiæ curam subire!" (595. 34-5; cf. 50.) The Benedictine biographer (III. i. 16-7) says that Gregory objected to the title of *œcumenical* only as meaning *sole* bishop, and not in the sense in which later popes have used it. The truth is, however, that he objected to it in the later Roman sense rather than in that which the patriarchs of Constantinople intended. (See Dupin, v. 110; Laud against Fisher, p. 198, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib.) Schröckh (xvii. 69-72) is unfair to Gregory in this as in other points. Gregory, in tacit reproof of John, styled himself "servant of God's servants" (*servus servorum Dei*); but this title was not (as has sometimes been said) invented by him. It was as old as St. Augustine's time, was used by other bishops, and even by kings, and did not become peculiar to the popes of Rome until the eleventh century. Schröckh, xvii. 78-9; Gieseler, I. ii. 414.

[t] Fleury, xxxv. 47.

[u] Ep. vii. 1, 31; Schröckh, xvii. 50.

had arisen. Maurice favoured John personally; he represented the question of the patriarch's title as trifling, and was deaf to Gregory's appeals on the subject.[x] He often espoused the cause of bishops or others whom Gregory wished to censure, and reminded him that the troubles of the time made it inexpedient to insist on the rigour of discipline.[y] By forbidding persons in public employment to become monks, and requiring that soldiers should not embrace the monastic life until after the expiration of their term of service, he provoked the pope to tell him A.D. 593. that this measure might cost him his salvation, although, in fulfilment of his duty as a subject, Gregory transmitted the law to other bishops.[z] Moreover there were differences arising out of Gregory's political conduct, which the exarchs and other imperial officers had represented to their master in an unfavourable light.[a] Thus the friendship of former days had been succeeded by alienation, when in 602 Maurice was dethroned by his subjects, the discontent which had been growing for years having been at last swelled into revolt by the belief that he had allowed twelve thousand captive soldiers to be butchered by the Avars when it was in his power to ransom them.[b] A centurion, named Phocas, was raised to the throne, and soon after caused Maurice and his children to be put to death with revolting cruelties, which the victims bore with extraordinary firmness and with devout resignation.[c] The behaviour of Gregory on this occasion has exposed him to censures from which his apologists have in vain endeavoured to clear him. Blinded by his zeal for the Church, and by his dislike of the late emperor's policy, he hailed with exultation the success of an usurper whom all agree in representing as a monster of vice and barbarity.[d] He received with honour the pictures of Phocas and his wife, placed them in the chapel of a palace, and addressed the new emperor and empress in letters of warm congratulation.[e] He now wrote again to Cyriac, July, 603.

[x] Schröckh, xvii. 343; Lau, 106.

[y] Baron. 590. 43.

[z] Ep. iii. 65. Ste. Marthe remarks that the law was needed against those who in that age were ready to take refuge in cloisters when the state required their administrative or military services, and justifies the regulation as to soldiers by the analogy of similar canons as to slaves – soldiers being bound as truly as slaves for the term of their engagement. (II. x. 3.) As to the subsequent alteration of the law, see Lau, 109. Comp. De Marca, II. xi. 8-9.

[a] See Ep. v. 40, to Maurice, A.D. 594.

[b] Lau, 45. Mr. Finlay (i. 369-370) supposes that Maurice wished to punish the troops for their late mutinous conduct, and that he did not expect the Avars to put them to death.

[c] Theophanes, 439-443; Joh. Diac. iv. 17-18; Gibbon, iv. 295.

[d] Baron. 603. 9; Maimbourg, in Bayle, art. *Grégoire*, n. II.; Gibbon, iv. 299-300.

[e] Epp. xiii. 31, 39; Baron. 603, 2; Lau, 232-3. For censures on his conduct, see Bayle, art. *Grégoire I.*; Mo-

exhorting him to abandon the title which had occasioned so much contention.[f] Phocas found it convenient to favour the Roman side, and for a time the word was given up or forbidden.[g] But the next emperor, Heraclius, again used it in addressing the bishops of Constantinople; their use of it was sanctioned by the sixth and seventh general councils, and it has been retained to the present day.[h]

Gregory was zealous in his endeavours to extend the knowledge of the Gospel, and to bring over separatists to the Church. He laboured, and with considerable, although not complete success, to put an end to the schism of Aquileia and Istria, which had arisen out of the controversy as to the "Three Articles" and the Fifth General Council.[i] In order to this purpose, he was willing to abstain from insisting on the reception of that Council; the first four Councils, he said, were to be acknowledged like the four Gospels; "that which by some was called the Fifth" did not impugn the Council of Chalcedon; but it related to personal matters only, and did not stand on the same footing with the others.[k] Thus he was able to establish a reconciliation between Constantius, bishop of Milan, an adherent of the Council, and Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, although the queen persisted in refusing to condemn the "Three Articles."[m] The influence of this

A.D. 593.

sheim, ii. 19; Gibbon, iv. 299; Milman, i. 460-3. John the Deacon (iv. 23), Baronius (603. 7), the Benedictines (Vita, IV. vii. 4-5; not. in Ep. xiii. 31), and others suggest that Gregory meant to indicate to Phocas what his conduct *ought* to be; that he did not suspect his hypocrisy or foresee his misconduct, &c. Dom Pitra goes to the Iliad for a justification—"S'il descend à la louange officielle envers l'assassin de Maurice, *souvenons-nous de Priam aux pieds d'Achille.*" (Hist. de S. Léger, p. xxxiii.) But M. Rohrbacher settles the question more boldly, and to his own perfect satisfaction. After quoting Gregory's letter to Phocas, "C'est ainsi," says the Abbé, "que le chef de l'Eglise universelle, le chef de l'univers Chrétien, juge l'empereur qui n'est plus, et admoneste celui qui le remplace!" (ix. 513.) Gregory's frequent compliments to the Frankish queen Brunichild afford grounds for the same sort of charges with his letter to Phocas. The Benedictines and other Romanists argue that either Brunichild was not what she is said to have been, and that the crimes of Fredegund have been ascribed to her; *or* that her misdeeds must have been after Gregory's death; *or* that Gregory knew of her good actions from herself and had no means of knowing her evil deeds. (Vita, III. iii. 6; not. in Ep. vi. 5; Mariana, ii. 108.) Neander in both cases defends him, on the ground that he could not get correct information from distant countries, but allows that he went too far in his civilities to Phocas. (v. 156.) Lau gives up the defence in both affairs. (192-3, 233-4.)

[f] Ep. xiii. 40.

[g] It has been said that Phocas afterwards granted the title to Gregory's successors, but see Schröckh, xvii. 73; Planck, i. 655.

[h] Sammarth. iii. 1; Gieseler, I. ii. 414. See for the later history of the title, Schröckh, xvii. 73-8.

[i] Epp. ix. 9; xii. 33, &c.; Joh. Diac. i. 47-50; Baron. 590. 35-43; Schröckh, xvii. 261-2; Lau, 67-71, 143-8.

[k] Epp. iii. 16; iv. 2-4. 38-9.

[m] Baron. 593. 31-9; 594. 1, seqq. Sammarth. II. xii. 1-3.

princess was of great advantage to the pope, both in religious and in political affairs. According to the usual belief, she was daughter of the prince of the Bavarians, and had been trained in the Catholic faith. It is said that on the death of her husband, the Lombard king Autharit, her people desired her to choose another, and promised to accept him for their sovereign; and her choice fell on Agilulf, duke of Turin, who, out of gratitude for his elevation, was disposed to show favour to her religion, and to listen to her mediation in behalf of the Romans.[n] The statement of some writers,[o] that Agilulf himself became a Catholic, appears to be erroneous; but his son was baptised into the Church, and in the middle of the seventh century Arianism was extinct among the Lombards.[p] A.D. 590.

Towards those who were not members of the Church Gregory was in general tolerant. That he urged the execution of the laws against the Donatists is an exception which the fanatical violence of the sect may serve to explain, if not even to justify.[q] He protected the Jews in the exercise of their religion,[r] and disapproved of the forcible measures by which some princes of Gaul and Spain had attempted to drive them to a profession of Christianity.[s] When a bishop of Palermo had seized and consecrated a synagogue, Gregory ordered that as, when once consecrated, it could not be alienated from the Church, he should pay the value of it to the Jews.[t] On another occasion, when a convert from Judaism, having been baptised on Easter eve, had signalized his zeal by invading the synagogue of Cagliari on the following day, and placing in it his baptismal robe, with a cross and a picture of the blessed Virgin, he was censured for the proceeding, and it was ordered that the building should be restored to the rightful owners.[u] Sometimes, however, Gregory endeavoured to expedite the conversion of Jews by holding out allowances of money or

[n] Pagi, x. 506; Schröckh, xviii. 130-1; Lau, 46, 61. This is the statement of Paul Warnefrid (De Gestis Langob. iii. 36. Bib. Patr. xiii. 178); but Rettberg thinks it fabulous, because Fredegar (c. 34) makes her a Frankish princess, and names no other husband than "Ago," *i. e.* Agilulf. ii. 180.

[o] Paul. Warnef. ap. Baron. 591. 50.

[p] Schröckh, xviii. 131.

[q] Ep. iv. 34, &c.; Baron. 591. 32-7; 592. 3-4; Lau, 72.

[r] Ep. vi. 23; Schröckh, xvii. 320-3; Lau, 142.

[s] Epp. i. 47; iii. 53. Such compulsory conversions are often mentioned in the records of the time. The IVth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) enacted that Jews should not be "saved against their will," but that those who had been compelled to profess Christianity in the reign of the late king Sisebut, should still be obliged to adhere to their profession. (Can. lvii. ap. Hard. iii. 590.) Children of Jews are to be separated from their parents, and to be Christianly trained in monasteries or elsewhere. Can. lx.

[t] Ep. ix. 55.

[u] Ep. ix. 6.

diminution of rent as inducements, and by increasing the rent of those who were obstinate in their misbelief;[x] and, although he expressed a consciousness that conversion produced by such means might be hypocritical, he justified them by the consideration that the children of the converts would enjoy Christian training, and might thus become sincere professors of the Gospel.[y]

Gregory endeavoured to root out the remains of Paganism which still existed in some parts of Italy, and in the islands of Sardinia and Corsica. He wrote in reproof of landowners—some of them even bishops—who allowed their peasants to continue in heathenism, and of official persons who suffered themselves to be bribed into conniving at it.[z] Sometimes he recommended lenity as the best means of converting the pagan rustics; sometimes the imposition of taxes, or even personal chastisement.[a]

But the most memorable of Gregory's attempts for the conversion of the heathen had our own island for its scene. It is probable that many of the Britons who had become slaves to the northern invaders retained some sort of Christianity;[b] but the visible appearance of a church no longer existed among them; the last bishops within the Saxon territory are said to have withdrawn from London and York into Wales about the year 587.[c] The zeal of controversy has largely affected the representations given by many writers of the subject at which we have now arrived. Those in the Roman interest have made it their object to narrow as much as possible the extent of the British Christianity, to disparage its character, and to reflect on the British clergy for their supineness and uncharitableness in neglecting to impart the knowledge of salvation to their Saxon neighbours. And, while some Anglican writers have caught this tone, without sufficiently considering what abatements may fairly be made from the declamations of Gildas and from the statements of ancient authors unfriendly to the Britons; or whether, in the fierce struggles of war, and in the state of bondage which followed, it would have been even possible for these to attempt the conversion of their conquerors and oppressors—other Protestants have committed the opposite injustice of decrying the motives and putting the worst construction on the actions of those who were instrumental in the conversion which proceeded from Italy.[d]

[x] E. g. Epp. iv. 32; v. 8.
[y] Ep. v. 8.
[z] Epp. iv. 23-6; v. 41; vi. 1, 18; Lau, 102.
[a] Ep. iv. 26; ix 65; Lau, 242-3.
[b] Lingard, H. E. i. 89; Lappenberg, transl. i. 138.
[c] Collier, i. 144.
[d] See Schröckh, xvi. 268; Neander, v. 15; Lappenb. tr. i. 135.

It will be enough to allude to the familiar story of the incident which is said to have first directed Gregory's mind towards the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons—the sight of the fair-haired captives in the slave-market, and the string of verbal allusions by which he declared that these *Angles* of *angelic* beauty, subjects of *Aella*, king of *Deira*, must be called from the *ire* of God, and taught to sing *Alleluiah*.[e] The date of this is placed by some in the early days of his monastic life;[f] by others, after his return from Constantinople.[g] He resolved to undertake a mission to Britain, and the Pope (whether Benedict or Pelagius) sanctioned the enterprise; but the people of Rome, who were warmly attached to Gregory, made such demonstrations that he was obliged to abandon it.[h] Although, however, he was thus prevented from executing the work in person, he kept it in view until, after his elevation to the papal chair, he was able to commit it to the agency of others.

Ethelbert had succeeded to the kingdom of Kent in 568, and in 593 had attained the dignity of Bretwalda, which gave him an influence over the whole of England south of the Humber.[i] About 570, as is supposed, he had married a Christian princess, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of Paris. As a condition of this marriage, the free exercise of her religion was secured for the queen, and a French bishop, named Luidhard, accompanied her to the Kentish court.[k] It is probable that Bertha, in the course of her long union with Ethelbert, had made some attempts, at least indirectly, to influence him in favour of the Gospel; perhaps, too, it may have been from her that Gregory received representations which led him to suppose that many of the Anglo-Saxons were desirous of Christian instruction, and that the Britons refused to bestow it on them.[l] In 596, during an interval of peace with the Lombards,[m] he despatched Augustine, provost of his own monastery, with a party of monks, to preach the Gospel in England; and about the same time he desired Candidus, defensor of the papal estates in Gaul, to buy up English captive youths and to place them in monasteries, with a view to training them for the conversion of their countrymen.[n] But the missionaries, while in the South of

[e] Paul. 17; Beda, ii. 1. Mr. Soames disbelieves the story. Ang. Sax. Ch. 32-3; Latin Ch. 13-4.

[f] Joh. Diac. i. 22; Fleury, xxxiv. 35.

[g] Lau, 36.

[h] Paul. 19-21.

[i] Beda, i. 25; ii. 5; Turner, i. 328, 338; Lingard, H. E. i. 88; Lappenberg, tr. i. 126-8.

[k] Beda, i. 25; Inett, i. 7.

[l] See Epp. vi. 58; xi. 29; Inett, i. 8-10; Schröckh, xvi. 269; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 23.

[m] Lau, 139.

[n] Ep. vi. 7. The commission to Candidus is placed by many writers (as Thierry, i. 49, and Lau, 213) some considerable time before the mission of

France, took alarm at the thought of the dangers which they were likely to incur among a barbarous and unbelieving people whose language was utterly unknown to them, and their chief returned to Rome, with a prayer that they might be allowed to relinquish the enterprise. Gregory refused his consent; he encouraged them to go on, and furnished them with letters to various princes and bishops of Gaul, whom he requested to support them by their influence,[o] and to supply them with interpreters. In 597 Augustine, with about forty companions, landed in the Isle of Thanet. Ethelbert, on being apprised of their arrival, went to meet them; and at an interview, which was held in the open air, because he feared lest they might practise some magical arts if he ventured himself under a roof with them, he listened to their announcement of the message of salvation.[p] He professed himself unable at once to abandon the belief of his fathers for the new doctrines, but gave the missionaries leave to take up their abode in his capital, Durovernum, or Canterbury, and to preach freely among his subjects. They entered the city in procession, chanting litanies and displaying a silver cross with a picture of the Saviour. Without the walls they found a church of the Roman-British period, dedicated to St. Martin, in which Luidhard had lately celebrated his worship,[q] and to this day the spot on which it stood, overlooking the valley of the Stour, is occupied by a little church, which, after many architectural changes, exhibits a large proportion of ancient Roman materials. There Augustine and his brethren worshipped; and by the spectacle of their devout and self-denying lives, and of the miracles which are said to have accompanied their preaching,[r] many converts were drawn to them. Ethelbert himself was baptised on Whitsunday, 597; he declared his wish that his subjects should embrace the Gospel, but professed himself resolved to put no constraint on their opinions.[s]

Gregory had intended that Augustine, if he succeeded in making an opening among the Saxons, should receive episcopal consecration.[t] For this purpose Augustine now repaired to Arles,[u] and thence he

Augustine. But it appears from Ep. vi. 57, that Augustine and Candidus went into Gaul together. Lingard, A. S. C. i. 21.

[o] Ep. vi. 51-4, 57-9; Beda, i. 23. In his letter to Theodoric and Theodebert (vi. 58) he seems to speak as if he supposed the Saxons to be their subjects—probably by way of compliment. See Lappenb. tr. i. 116; Thierry, i. 51.

[p] Beda, i. 25.

[q] That Luidhard was then dead, see Pagi in Baron. x. 619.

[r] See Martineau, 45, seqq.

[s] Beda, i. 26; Pagi, x. 620.

[t] Beda, i. 23.

[u] That his consecration was after his first success, not (as some have thought) on his way to Britain—see Pagi in Baron. x. 619; Inett, i. 20; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 64, 368.

sent some of his companions to Rome with a report of his successes. Gregory's answer contains advice which may be understood as hinting at some known defects of the missionary's character, or as suggested by the tone of his report. He exhorts him not to be elated by his success or by the miracles which he had been enabled to perform; he must reckon that these were granted not for his own sake, but for that of the people to whom he was sent.[x] Augustine returned to England by Christmas, 597; and Gregory was able to announce to Eulogius of Alexandria that at that festival the missionaries had baptised ten thousand persons in one day.[y]

In the summer of 601 Gregory despatched a reinforcement to the English mission. The new auxiliaries—among whom were Mellitus and Justus, successively archbishops of Canterbury, and Paulinus, afterwards the apostle of Northumbria—carried with them a quantity of books, including the Gospels, with church plate, vestments, relics said to be of apostles and martyrs, and the pall which was to invest Augustine with the dignity of a metropolitan.[z] Gregory had written to Ethelbert, exhorting him to destroy the heathen temples in his dominions;[a] but, on further consideration, he took a different view of the matter, and sent after Mellitus a letter for the guidance of Augustine, desiring him not to destroy the temples, but, if they were well built, to purify them with holy water and convert them to the worship of the true God; thus, it was hoped, the people might be the more readily attracted to the new religion, if its rites were celebrated in places where they had been accustomed to worship. By a more questionable accommodation of the same sort—for which, however, Gregory alleged the authority of Scripture—it was directed that, instead of the heathen sacrifices and of the banquets which followed them, the festivals of the saints whose relics were deposited in any church should be celebrated by making booths of boughs, slaying animals, and feasting on them with religious thankfulness.[b]

About the same time Gregory sent an elaborate set of answers to some questions which Augustine had proposed as to difficulties which had occurred or might be expected to occur to him.[c] As to the division of ecclesiastical funds, he states the Roman principle—that a fourth part should be assigned to the bishop and his household for purposes of hospitality; a fourth to the clergy;

[x] Ep. xi. 28; Beda, i. 31.
[y] Ep. viii. 30; Beda, i. 27.
[z] Beda, i. 29; Epp. xi. 58-63, 66, &c.
[a] Ep. xi. 66.
[b] Ep. xi. 76; Bed. i. 30. See Inett, i. 23-5; Lau, 225; Martineau, 53; Ozanam, 159.
[c] Ep. xi. 64; Beda, i. 27.

another to the poor; and the remaining quarter to the maintenance of churches. But he says that Augustine, as having been trained in the monastic rule, is to live in the society of his clergy; and that it is needless to lay down any precise regulations as to the duties of hospitality and charity where all things are held in common, and all that can be spared is to be devoted to pious and religious uses. Such of the clerks not in holy orders[d] as might wish to marry might be permitted to do so, and a maintenance was to be allowed them. In answer to a question whether a variety of religious usages were allowable where the faith was the same—a question probably suggested by the circumstance of Luidhard's having officiated at Canterbury according to the Gallican rite[e]—Gregory's reply was in a spirit no less unlike to that of his predecessors, Innocent and Leo, than to that of the prevalent party in the Latin Church of our own day. He desired Augustine to select for the usages of any churches such "right, religious, and pious" things as might seem suitable for the new church of the Anglo-Saxons; "for," it was said, "we must not love things on account of places, but places on account of good things."[f] Other questions related to the degrees within which persons were to be forbidden to marry. Gregory, while laying down a law for the baptised, on pain of exclusion from the holy Eucharist, did not insist on the separation of those who from ignorance had contracted marriages contrary to it: "for," he said, "the Church in this time corrects some sins out of zeal, bears with some out of lenity, connives at some out of consideration, and so bears and connives as by this means often to restrain the evil which she opposes." In answer to another inquiry, Augustine was told that he must not interfere with the bishops of Gaul beyond gently hinting to them such things as might seem to require amendment; "but," it was added, "we commit to your brotherhood the care of all the British bishops, that the ignorant may be instructed, the weak may be strengthened by your counsel, the perverse may be corrected by your authority."

It was Gregory's design that Augustine should make London

[d] "Clerici extra sacros ordines constituti." Mr. Kemble (ii. 414) seems to suppose that by "sacros ordines" orders of *monks* are meant; but the "holy orders" were those from the diaconate upwards, as is explained with reference to Gregory's letter in the Excerptions of Egbert (No. 160, in Wilkins, i. 112, or Thorpe, 34). The subdiaconate began to be included among the holy orders in the eleventh or twelfth century. Martene, ii. 2; Walter, 435.

[e] Johnson's Canons, i. 68.

[f] I have combined the reading of Bede, *bonis*, with that of Gregory's epistles, *nobis*.

his metropolitical see, and should have twelve bishops under him; that another metropolitan, with a like number of suffragans, should, when circumstances permitted, be established at York; and that, on the death of Augustine, the bishops of London and York should take precedence according to the date of their consecration. This scheme, arranged in ignorance of the political divisions which had been introduced into Britain since the withdrawal of the Romans, was never carried out. Augustine fixed himself in the Kentish capital, as London was in another kingdom; and the archbishops of Canterbury have, although not without disputes during one period, continued to be primates of all England.[g]

The bishops of the ancient British Church were not disposed to acknowledge the jurisdiction which Gregory had professed to confer on his emissary. Augustine, through the influence of Ethelbert, obtained a conference with some of them at a place which from him was called Augustine's Oak—probably Aust Clive, on the Severn.[h] (A.D. 603.) He exhorted them to adopt the Roman usages as to some points in which the churches differed, and proposed an appeal to the Divine judgment by way of deciding between the rival traditions. A blind Saxon was brought forward; the Britons were unable to cure him; but when Augustine prayed that the gift of bodily light to one might be the means of illuminating the minds of many, it is said that the man forthwith received his sight. The Britons acknowledged the superiority of the Roman cause, but said that they could not alter their customs without consulting their countrymen, and a second conference was appointed. Seven British bishops appeared at it, with Dinoth, abbot of the great monastery of Bangor Iscoed, in Flintshire. A hermit, whom they had consulted as to the manner in which they should act, had ordered them to submit to Augustine if he were a man of God. On being asked how they should know this, he told them to observe whether Augustine rose up to greet them on their arrival at the place of meeting.[i] As the archbishop omitted to do so, the Britons concluded that he was proud and domineering, and would not listen to his proposal that their other differences of observance should be borne with if they would comply with the Roman usages as to the time of keeping Easter, and as to the

[g] Bede, i. 29; Johnson, i. 74; Kemble, ii. 359. See the letter of Archbishop Ralph to Calixtus II., A.D. 1121. Wilkins, i. 398; W. Malmesb. Gest. Pont. iii. 7.

[h] Stevenson, Note on Bed. ii. 2. Others place it in Worcestershire. (Joyce, 'England's Sacred Synods,' 111.) Mr. Stanley, at Bristol. 'Memorials of Canterbury,' 16, ed. i.

[i] See Collier, i. 177, against Baronius.

manner of administering baptism,[k] and would join with him in preaching to the English. Augustine is said to have told them in anger that, if they would not have peace with their brethren, they would have war with their enemies, and suffer death at the hands of those to whom they refused to preach the way of life.[m] In judging of this affair, we shall do well to guard against the partiality which has led many writers to cast the blame on the Romans or on the Britons exclusively. We may respect in the Britons their desire to adhere to old ways and to resist foreign assumption; in the missionaries, their anxiety to establish unity in externals with a view to the great object of spreading the Gospel; but the benefits which might have been expected were lost through the arrogant demeanour of the one party and the narrow and stubborn jealousy of the other.[n]

Augustine is supposed to have died soon after the conference.[o] Before his death he had consecrated Justus to the bishoprick of Rochester, and Mellitus to that of London, the capital of Saberet, nephew of Ethelbert, and king of Essex;[p] he had also consecrated Lawrence as his own successor. The threat or prophecy which he had uttered at the conference with the Britons was supposed to be fulfilled some years after, when Ethelfrid, the pagan king of Bernicia, invaded their territory. In a battle at Caerleon on the Dee, Ethelfrid saw a number of unarmed men, and on inquiring was told that they were monks of Bangor who had come to pray for the success of their countrymen. "Then," he cried, "although they have no weapons, they are

A.D. 613?

[k] "Ut ministerium baptizandi, quo Deo renascimur, juxta morem sanctæ Romanæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ compleatis." Dr. Lingard (A. S. C. i. 69, 322) and Mr. Stevenson (Eng. Ch. Historians, i. 358), render *compleatis*, by "perfect," and suppose it to refer to confirmation, which at Rome was administered at the great festivals immediately after baptism. Archdeacon Churton (Early Eng. Ch. 44) and Mr. Martineau (56) understand it to relate to the question of one or three immersions. The second view seems to me the more probable, although, if Augustine insisted on the Roman practice of trine immersion, it was contrary to the directions given by Gregory for Spain, where he approved the practice of the Catholics in baptizing by single immersion, because the Arians had used three as symbolising their doctrine of the inferiority of the Second and Third persons in the Godhead. Ep. i. 43.

[m] Beda, ii. 2.

[n] As nothing is said of any discussion about the Roman supremacy, Dr. Lingard (A. S. C. i. 67, 62, 380) infers that on that subject the Britons did not differ from the missionaries. But how could they have more effectually disowned any such supremacy than by their conduct? If, as Dr. Lingard supposes (68), the story has been embellished, the embellishment must be in the *Roman* interest. A letter or speech, first published by Spelman, in which Dinoth is made to disavow the bishop of Rome, is, however, probably spurious. See Lingard, A. S. C. i. 71; Giesceler, I. ii. 462; Collier, i. 179; Inett, i. 33; Martineau, 57.

[o] His death is placed by some in the same year, 603; by Baronius in 604; by others, in 605; by Pagi, in 607 (xi. 74). See Hussey, n. in Bed. ii. 3.

[p] Inett, i. 38.

fighting against us;" and he ordered them to be put to the sword. About twelve hundred, it is said, were slain, and only fifty escaped by flight.[q]

Amidst the pressure of his manifold occupations, and notwithstanding frequent attacks of sickness, Gregory found time for the composition of extensive works. The most voluminous of these, the *Morals* on the book of Job, was undertaken at the suggestion of Leander, bishop of Seville, with whom he had made acquaintance at Constantinople, where Leander was employed in soliciting the emperor to aid his convert Hermenegild.[r] Gregory's qualifications for commenting on Scripture were not of any critical kind; he repeatedly states that he was ignorant even of Greek.[s] The nature of his work is indicated by its title. From the circumstance that Job sometimes makes use of figurative language, he infers that in some passages the literal sense does not exist;[t] and he applies himself chiefly to explaining the typical and moral senses—often carrying to an extreme the characteristic faults of this kind of interpretation—strange wresting of the language of Scripture and introduction of foreign matter under pretence of explaining what is written.[u] He regards Job as a type of the Saviour; the patriarch's wife, as a representative of the carnally-minded; his friends, as representing heretics; their conviction as figuring the reconciliation of the heretics to the Church. The "Morals" were greatly admired. Marinian, bishop of Ravenna, caused them to be read in church; but Gregory desired that this might be given up, as the book, not being intended for popular use, might be rather a hindrance than a means of advancement to some hearers.[x]

The "Pastoral Rule," written in consequence of Gregory's having been censured by John, the predecessor of Marinian, for attempting to decline the episcopate, also contains some curious specimens of allegorical interpretation;[y] but it is characterised

[q] Beda, ii. 2. The genuineness of the words, in which it is said that Augustine was dead long before this, has been questioned, but is now generally admitted (Soames, Ang. Sax. Ch. 46; Stevenson in loc.). As Ethelfrid was a pagan, and beyond the limits of the Bretwalda's influence, it does not appear how Augustine could have instigated him against the Britons, if alive and desirous so to do.

[r] Ep. ad Leandr. prefixed to the book. Mariana, iv. 124; see vol. i. p. 192.

[s] Epp. vii. 32; xi. 74.

[t] Ep. ad Leandr. c. 3.

[u] See Milman, i. 435.

[x] Ep. xii. 24.

[y] Such as the commentary on the disqualifications for the priesthood. Levit. xxi. 18. The *nose*, it is said, signifies *discretion*. "Parvo autem naso est, qui ad tenendam mensuram discretionis idoneus non est. . . . Nasus enim grandis et tortus est discretionis subtilitas immoderata, quæ, dum plus quam decet excreverit, actionis suæ rectitudinem ipsa confundit" (i. 11).

by practical wisdom and by an experienced knowledge of the heart. It was translated into various languages; the Anglo-Saxon version was made by king Alfred, who sent a copy of it to every bishop in his kingdom for preservation in the cathedral church.[z] In France, it was adopted as the rule of episcopal conduct by reforming synods under Charlemagne and his son;[a] some synods ordered that it should be put into the hands of bishops at their consecration.[b]

In his "Dialogues" addressed to Theodelinda,[c] Gregory discourses with a deacon named Peter on the miracles of Italian saints. The genuineness of the work has been questioned, chiefly on account of the anile legends with which it is filled.[d] But the evidence of the authorship is generally admitted to be sufficient;[e] and it is to be noted to Gregory's praise that he repeatedly warns Peter against attaching too much value to the miracles which are related with such unhesitating credulity.[f] In the fourth book, the state of the soul after death is discussed. Peter asks why it is that new revelations are now made on the subject, and is told that the time is one of twilight between the present world and that which is to come; and that, consequently, such revelations are now seasonable.[g] The doctrine of Purgatory is here advanced more distinctly than in any earlier writing.[h] As every one departs hence, it is said, so is he presented in the judgment; yet we must believe that for some slight transgressions there is a purgatorial fire before the judgment day.[i] In proof of this are alleged the words of our Lord in St. Matthew xii. 32, from which it is inferred that some sins shall be forgiven "in the world to come;" and the doctrine is confirmed by tales of visions in which the spirits of persons suffering in purgatory had appeared, and had entreated that the eucharistic sacrifice might be offered in order to their

[z] Pauli, 'König Aelfred,' 236. Berlin, 1851.

[a] Conc. Mogunt. ap. Hard. iv. 1008; Conc. Rem. c. 10; Conc. Turon. c. 3; Conc. Cabilon. c. 1; all in A.D. 813. Conc. Paris, A.D. 829, c. 4; Conc. Aquisgr. A.D. 836, Cap. ii. 4, &c.

[b] Hincmar, t. ii. p. 389; Dupin, v. 134-5; Lau, 315.

[c] In this circumstance Dean Milman sees the best apology for the legends which Gregory has stamped with his authority. "They might be, if not highly coloured, selected with less scruple, to impress the Lombard queen with the wonder-working power of the Roman clergy, and of the orthodox monks and bishops of Italy," i. 458.

[d] In one of these we find a prototype for the popular story of the London trader who was seen running into the crater of Etna at a time which was found to coincide with that of his death. In Gregory's tale (iv. 30) Theodoric the Goth is thrown into Lipari by Symmachus and Pope John, who had been his victims. (See vol. i. pp. 472-3.)

[e] Dupin, v. 137-8; Schröckh, xvii. 322-5; Lau, 316-8; Bahr, ii. 448.

[f] See Neander, v. 202-3.

[g] Dial. iv. 41.

[h] Schröckh, xvii. 332-3; Lau, 508; Gieseler, I. ii. 434-5; Hagenbach, i. 382.

[i] Dial. iv. 39.

relief. A work in which religious instruction was thus combined with the attractions of romantic fiction naturally became very popular. Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741-752) rendered it into his native Greek.[k] It was translated into Anglo-Saxon under Alfred's care, by Werfrith, Bishop of Worcester;[m] and among the other translations was one into Arabic.[n]

Gregory has been accused of having destroyed or mutilated the monuments of ancient Roman greatness in order that they might not distract the attention of pilgrims, and of having, from a like motive, burnt the Palatine library, and endeavoured to exterminate the copies of Livy's history. These stories are now rejected as fictions invented during the middle ages with a view of doing honour to his zeal;[o] but it is unquestionable that he disliked and discouraged pagan literature. In the epistle prefixed to his 'Morals' he professes himself indifferent to style, and even to grammatical correctness, on the ground that the words of inspiration ought not to be tied down under the rules of Donatus.[p] And in a letter to Desiderius, bishop of Vienne, who was reported to have given lessons in "grammar," he does not confine his rebuke to the unseemliness of such employment for a member of the episcopal order, but declares that even a religious layman ought not to defile his lips with the blasphemous praises of false deities.[q] However this contempt of secular learning may be excused in Gregory himself, it is to be regretted that his authority did much to foster a contented ignorance in the ages which followed.[r]

In other respects his notions were those of his age, controlled in some measure by his practical good sense. His reverence for the authority of the Church may be inferred from his repeated declarations, that he regarded the first four general councils as standing on the same level with the four Gospels.[s] It has been argued from some passages in his works that he held the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Eucharist;[t] but his words,

[k] Anastasius, 165.

[m] Pauli's Aelfred, 237.

[n] Schröckh, xvii. 335.

[o] See Bayle, art. *Grégoire I.*, notes L, M, N; Gibbon, iv. 268; Gieseler, I. ii. 389. Schröckh's dislike of Gregory, however, inclines him to believe the tale as to the library, xvi. 59.

[p] Ad Leand. 5.

[q] Ep. xi. 54. See Bayle, note M; Neander, v. 207; Lau, 304. The Benedictines wish to suppose that Gregory did not blame the thing but the manner. But the work from which they quote a sanction of profane learning is spurious; and the passage in the epistle to Leander rather favours the opposite view. Lau, 20. Desiderius was murdered by Brunichild's contrivance in 607, and has been canonised. Vita S. Desider. ap. Bouquet, iii. 484.

[r] Fleury, xxxvi. 35; Gieseler, I. ii. 388.

[s] Epp. i. 25; iii. 10. See above, p. 12.

[t] As Dialog. iv. 58, quoted in Praef. Bened. p. 29. See Schröckh, xvii. 305; Lau, 483-4.

although sometimes highly rhetorical, do not seem to affirm any other than a *spiritual* presence of the Saviour's body and blood in the consecrated elements.

After what has been said of his character and history, it is hardly necessary to state that Gregory was a zealous friend to monachism. In many cases he exempted monks from episcopal jurisdiction as to the management of their affairs, leaving, however, to the bishop the superintendence of their morals.[u] But, notwithstanding his love for the monastic life, he detected and denounced many of the deceits which may be compatible with asceticism; perhaps his disagreements with John "the Faster" may have led him to see these evils the more clearly.[x] His exertions extended the obligations to celibacy among the clergy; but, in ordering that the sub-deacons of Sicily should in future be restrained from marriage, he revoked an order by which those who had already married were compelled to separate from their wives.[y]

A veneration for relics is strongly marked in Gregory's writings. It was his practice to send, in token of his especial favour, presents of keys, in which were said to be contained some filings of St. Peter's chains. These keys were accompanied by some such prayer as that that which had bound the Apostle for martyrdom might loose the receiver from all his sins;[z] and to some of them miraculous histories were attached.[a] The empress Constantina—instigated, it is supposed, by John of Constantinople, with a view of bringing Gregory into trouble[b]—asked him to send her the head, or some part of the body, of St. Paul, for a new church which was built in honour of the Apostle. Gregory answered, that it was not the custom at Rome to handle or to dispose of the bodies of martyrs; that many persons who had presumed to touch the remains of St. Peter and St. Paul had been struck with death in consequence; that he could only send her a cloth which had been applied to the Apostle's body, but that such cloths were of the same miraculous power as the relics themselves. He added, that the practice of removing relics gave occasion to fraud, and mentioned the case of some Greek monks who, on being found digging up dead bodies by night at Rome, confessed an intention of passing them off in Greece as relics of martyrs.[c]

[u] Schröckh, 301-3; Gieseler, I. ii. 426; Lau, 130.

[x] Neander, v. 206; Lau, 126.

[y] Ep. i. 44. His regulations on this subject are summed up by Theiner, i. 355, *seq.*

[z] Ep. vi. 6; vii. 28, and elsewhere.

[a] Ep. vii. 26.

[b] Baron. 594. 25; 595. 29; Sammarth. II. xi. 7.

[c] Ep. iv. 30.

Two of Gregory's letters,[d] addressed to Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, relate to the subject of images. Serenus, finding that some images were the subjects of adoration, had broken them; the Pope commends his zeal, but blames him for the manner in which it had been displayed. He tells him that modesty ought to have restrained him from an action for which no bishop had given any precedent; that pictures and images serve for the instruction of those who cannot read books; and that for this purpose they ought to be preserved in churches, while care should be taken to guard against the worship of them.[e]

Gregory's infirmities had long been growing on him. For some years he had been seldom able to leave his bed;[f] he professed that the expectation of death was his only consolation, and requested his friends to pray for his deliverance from his sufferings.[g] On the 12th of March, 604, he was released.[h]

While the conversion of the English was reserved for the zeal of Italian monks, a remarkable body of missionaries set out from the shores of Ireland. Their leader, Columban,[i] born in the province of Leinster about 560, was trained in the great Irish monastery of Bangor, which contained a society of three thousand monks, under the government of its founder, Comgal.[k] Columban resolved to detach himself from earthly things by leaving his country after the example of Abraham, and in 589 crossed the sea with twelve companions, first into Britain, and thence into Gaul. He had intended to preach the gospel to the heathen nations beyond the Frankish dominions; but the decayed state of religion and discipline offered him abundant employment in Gaul, and, at the invitation of Guntram king of Burgundy,[m] he settled in that country.[n] Declining the king's offers of a better position, he established himself in the Vosges, where a district which in the Roman times was cultivated and populous had again become a wilderness, while abundant remains of Roman architecture and monuments of the old idolatry were left as evidence of its former prosperity. Here he successively founded three monasteries, Anegray, Luxeuil, and Fontaines. For a time the missionaries had to endure great hardships; they had often for days no other food

[d] Ep. ix. 105; xi. 13.
[e] See Basnage, 1336.
[f] Ep. xi. 44.
[g] Ep. xiii. 22.
[h] Lau, 299.
[i] Vita S. Columb. by Jonas, a monk of Bobbio, in Mabillon, ii.
[k] Jonas, 6-9; Lanigan, ii. 201.
[m] See Mabillon, ii. 10.
[n] Jonas, 10; Walaf. Strabo, Vit. S. Galli, in Bouquet, iii. 474 seqq.; Rettberg, ii. 36-7.

than wild herbs and the bark of trees, until their needs were supplied by means which are described as miraculous.[o] But by degrees the spectacle of their hard and devoted life made an impression on the people of the neighbourhood. They were looked on with reverence by men of every class; and while their religious instructions were gladly heard, their labours in clearing and tilling the land encouraged the inhabitants to exertions of the same kind. The monasteries were speedily filled with persons attracted by the contrast which Columban's system presented to the general relaxation of piety and morals among the native monks and clergy; and children of noble birth were placed in them for education.[p]

The Rule of Columban[q] was probably derived in great measure from the Irish Bangor.[r] The main principle of it was the inculcation of absolute obedience to superiors, the entire mortification of the individual will[s]—a principle which is dangerous, as relieving the mind from the feeling of responsibility, and as tending either to deaden the spirit, or to deceive it into pride veiled under the appearance of humility.[t] The diet of the monks was to be coarse,[u] and was to be proportioned to their labour. But Columban warned against excessive abstinence, as being "not a virtue but a vice."[x] "Every day," it was said, "there must be fasting, as every day there must be refreshment;" and every day the monks were also to pray, to work, and to read. There were to be three services by day and three by night, at hours variable according to the season.[y] The monastic plainness was extended even to the sacred vessels, which were not to be of any material more costly than brass.[z] To the Rule was attached a Penitential, which, instead of leaving to the abbot the same discretion in the appointment of punishments which was allowed by the Benedictine system, lays down the details with curious minuteness. Corporal chastisement is the most frequent penalty. Thus, six lashes or blows were to be given to every one who should omit to say "Amen" after the abbot's blessing, or to make the sign of the cross on his spoon or his candle; to every one who should talk at meals, or who should not repress a cough at the beginning of a psalm.[a] Ten lashes were the punishment for striking the table with a knife, or for spilling beer on it.[b] For heavier offences the number rose as high as two hundred; but in

[o] Jonas, 13-19.
[p] Neander, v. 40; Michelet, i. 383.
[q] Printed in Biblioth. Patrum, t. xii.
[r] Lanigan, ii. 267.
[s] Cc. 1, 10.
[t] Schröckh, xvii. 423; Neander, Mem. 438; Rettberg, ii. 37.
[u] "Vilis et *respectivus*." c. 3.
[x] Ibid. [y] C. 6.
[z] Fleury, xxxv. 10.
[a] Pœnitentiale, cc. 1, 4.
[b] Cc. 2, 3.

no case were more than twenty-five to be inflicted at once. Among the other penances were fasting on bread and water, psalm-singing, humble postures, and long periods of silence. Penitents were not allowed to wash their hands except on Sunday. They were obliged to kneel at prayers even on the Lord's Day and in the Pentecostal season. Columban warned his monks against relying on externals; but it may fairly be questioned whether his warnings can have been powerful enough to counteract the natural tendency of a system so circumstantial and so rigid in the enforcement of formal observances.[c]

Columban fell into disputes with his neighbours as to the time of keeping Easter, in which he followed the custom of his native country. He wrote on the subject to Gregory and to Boniface (either the third or the fourth pope of that name), requesting that they would not consider his practice as a ground for breach of communion.[d] In these and in his other letters to Popes, while he speaks with high respect of the Roman see, the British spirit of independence strongly appears. He exhorts Gregory to reconsider the question of the paschal cycle without deferring to the opinions of Leo or of other elder popes. "Perhaps," he says, "in this case, a living dog may be better than a dead *lion*."[e] He even sets the church of Jerusalem above that of Rome: "You," he tells Boniface, "are almost heavenly, and Rome is the head of the Churches of the world, saving the special prerogative of the place of the Lord's resurrection."[f] And he goes on to say, that in proportion as the place of the Roman bishops is great, so ought their care to be great, lest by perversity they lose it. Another letter on the same subject is addressed to a Gaulish Synod.[g] He entreats the bishops to let him follow the usage to which he has been accustomed, and to allow him to live peaceably amid the solitude of the forest, as he had already lived for twelve years, beside the bones of his seventeen deceased brethren.

After a residence of about twenty years in Burgundy, Columban incurred the displeasure of king Theodoric, by whom he had before been held in great honour. Brunichild, the grandmother of Theodoric, according to a policy not uncommon among the queen-mothers of India in our own day, endeavoured to prolong her influence in the kingdom by encouraging the young prince in a life of indolence and sensuality.[h] Columban A.D. 610.

[c] Schröckh, xvii. 426; Neander, v. 41-2.
[d] Bibl. Patr. xii. 24, 28, 31.
[e] Greg. Ep. ix. 127. (Eccl. ix. 4.)
[f] Ep. iv. Bibl. Patr. xii. 30.
[g] Ep. ii. Bibl. Patr. xii. 25.
[h] Walafr. Strabo ap. Bouquet, iii. 474.

repeatedly, both by word and by letter, remonstrated against Theodoric's courses: he refused to bless his illegitimate children, and, with much vehemence of behaviour, rejected the hospitality of the court, making (it is said) the dishes and the drinking vessels which were set before him fly into pieces by his word.[i] Theodoric, whom Brunichild diligently instigated against him, told him that he was not unwise enough to make him a martyr, but ordered him to be conducted to Nantes with his Irish monks, in order that they might be sent back to their own country.[k] The journey of the missionaries across France was a series of triumphs. The vessel which was intended to convey them to Ireland was prevented, by causes which are described as miraculous, from performing its task.[m] Columban was then allowed to choose his own course, and made his way to Metz, where another of the Frankish kings, Theodebert, gave him leave to preach throughout his dominions.[n] He ascended the Rhine into Switzerland, and laboured for a time in the neighbourhood of Zug. Here, it is said, he found a number of the inhabitants assembled around a large vat of beer, and was told that it was intended as a sacrifice to Woden. By breathing on it, he made the vessel burst with a loud noise, so that, as his biographer tells us, "it was manifest that the devil had been hid in it."[o] He made many converts, but was driven, by the hostility of the idolatrous multitude, to remove into the neighbourhood of Bregenz, on the lake of Constance. There he found circumstances favourable to the success of his work. The country had formerly been Christian; many of its inhabitants had been baptised, although they had afterwards conformed to the idolatry of the Alamanni, who had overrun it; and the Alamannic law, made under Frankish influence, already provided for Christian clergy the same privileges which they enjoyed in France.[p] Columban was kindly received by a presbyter named Willimar:[q] he destroyed the idols of the people, threw them into the lake, and for a time preached with great success. But in 612, Theodebert was defeated by Theodoric, and Columban found it necessary to leave the territory which had thus fallen into the possession of his enemy.[r] He meditated a mission to the Slavons, but was diverted from the idea by an angel, and crossed the Alps into Italy, where he was received with honour

[i] Jonas, 31-2.
[k] Jonas, 33.
[m] Jonas, 47.
[n] Jonas, 51; Walaf. Strabo ap. Bouquet, iii. 475.
[o] Jonas, 53.
[p] Rettberg, ii. 16-8. The like was the case as to the Bavarian law, before the conversion of Bavaria, ibid. 218.
[q] Vit. ap. Pertz, ii. 8.
[r] Pagi, xi. 612; Sismondi, ii. 436.

by Agilulf and Theodelinda, and founded a monastery at Bobbio.[s] At the request of his Lombard patrons, he wrote to Boniface IV. on the controversy of the "Three Articles."[t] His knowledge of the question was very small: he had been possessed with opinions contrary to those of the Roman bishops respecting it; and perhaps this difference of views, together with his noted vehemence of character, might have led to serious disagreements, but that the danger was prevented by his death in the year 615.[u] Before that time he had refused an invitation from Clotaire II., who was then sole king of France, to return to his old abode at Luxeuil.[x]

Both Luxeuil and Bobbio became the parents of many monasteries in other quarters.[y] But the most celebrated of Columban's followers was his countryman Gall, who had been his pupil from boyhood, and had accompanied him in all his fortunes, until compelled by illness to remain behind, when his master passed into Italy. Gall founded in the year 614 the famous monastery which bears his name, and is honoured as the apostle of Switzerland.[z] He died in 627.[a]

[s] Jonas, 56, 59-60.

[t] Ep. iv.; Bibl. Patr. xii. 28-31. The address of this letter has often been quoted—"Pulcherrimo omnium totius Europæ ecclesiarum capiti, Papæ prædulci, præcelso præsuli, pastorum pastori, reverendissimo speculatori: humillimus celsissimo maximo, agrestis urbano, micrologus eloquentissimo, extremus primo, peregrinus indigenæ, pauperculus præpotenti (mirum dictu! nova res) rara avis, scribere audet Bonifacio patri Palumbus."

[u] Baron. 615. 15; Schröckh, xvii. 430; Neander, v. 46.

[x] Jonas, 61; Michelet, i. 384.

[y] Fleury, xxxvii. 8.

[z] For lives of St. Gall, see Mabillon, ii., and Pertz, ii.; also Neander, v. 45-9, and Memorials, 450; Ozanam, 120-7; Rettberg, ii. 40-8.

[a] Pagi in Bar. xi. 236.

CHAPTER II.

MAHOMET—THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY.

A.D. 610–718.

Phocas, after having earned universal detestation during a reign of eight years, was dethroned and put to death in 610, by Heraclius, the son of the Exarch of Africa.[a] The new emperor found himself involved in a formidable war with Chosroes II., king of Persia. Chosroes had formerly been driven from his kingdom, had found a refuge within the empire, and had been restored by the arms of Maurice.[b] On receiving the announcement of the accession of Phocas, he declared himself the avenger of his benefactor; he invaded the empire, repeatedly defeated the usurper's disorderly troops, and had advanced as far as Antioch, which fell into his hands immediately after the elevation of Heraclius.[c] The war for which the murder of Maurice had been the pretext, did not end with the removal of the murderer from power. Chosroes overran Syria and Palestine, and with one division of his force he conquered Egypt, and carried devastation as far as Tripoli, while another advanced to Chalcedon, and for ten years presented to the people of Constantinople the insulting and alarming spectacle of a hostile camp on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus.[d]

A.D. 611.

A.D. 611–622.

Between the Avars on the European side and the Persians on the east, Heraclius was reduced to extreme distress. He had almost resolved to return to Africa, which had recovered much of its old prosperity, and was then the most flourishing province of the empire;[e] but the patriarch of Constantinople obliged him to swear that he would not forsake those who had received him as their sovereign. At length, after having in vain attempted to appease Chosroes by offering to become his tributary, the emperor determined on the almost desperate enterprise of carrying the war into the enemy's country. He raised a large sum of money by loans—borrowing the plate and other wealth of churches on a promise of repayment with usury. With

A.D. 615.

[a] Gibbon, iv. 301-2.
[b] Gibbon, iv. 285-6.
[c] Gibbon, iv. 302-6; Finlay, i. 376.
[d] Gibbon, iv. 305-6.
[e] Finlay, i. 389.

this money he levied an army, and, having secured the forbearance of the Avars, made his way into the heart of Persia.[f] In six brilliant campaigns he recovered the provinces which had been lost. Chosroes fled before him, and, in 628, was deposed and put to death by his own son, who was glad to make peace with the Romans.[g] A.D. 622-7.

The war had on each side been one of religion. Chosroes was aided in his attack on Jerusalem by 26,000 Jews, collected from all quarters. On the capture of the city he destroyed churches, defiled the holy places, plundered the treasures accumulated from the offerings of pilgrims during three centuries of devotion, and carried off into Persia the patriarch Zacharias, with the relic which was venerated as the True Cross. It is said that 90,000 Christians were slain on this occasion, and that many of these were bought by the Jews for the purpose of butchering them.[h] Many Christians, however, fled into Egypt, where they were received with extraordinary kindness by John, patriarch of Alexandria, whose charities earned for him the title of "the Almsgiver."[i] Heraclius retaliated on the religion of Persia, by destroying its temples, especially that at Thebarmes, the birth-place of Zoroaster, and quenching the sacred fire.[k] He restored the cross with great triumph to Jerusalem, and the event was commemorated by a new festival—the Exaltation of the Cross.[m] And the edict of Hadrian against the Jews was renewed—forbidding them to approach within three miles of their holy city.[n]

While Chosroes was warring against the religion of the empire, a more formidable and lasting scourge of Christendom had arisen in Arabia.[o] The prevailing religion of that country is said to

[f] Theophanes, 466; Pagi, xi. 151; Gibbon, iv. 309-10; Schlosser, 52-9.

[g] Pagi, xi. 226-8; Gibbon, iv. 314-325; Finlay, i. 423-5.

[h] Theophanes, 463 (who gives other instances of Jewish hatred, p. 457); Baron. 614. 32; Gibbon, iv. 304-5. That the story is probably exaggerated, see Schröckh, xix. 299.

[i] See Baron. 610. 7-9; 614. 15; Fleury, xxxvii. 11, 12, 18.

[k] Gibbon, iv. 314-6; Finlay, i. 424.

[m] Baron. 627. 23-9; Gibbon, iv. 326-7. There is, however, a difference as to this between the Greek and the Latin churches. See Pagi, xi. 238; Fleury, xxxvii. 34.

[n] Dean Milman (Hist. of Jews, iii. 237-240, and n. on Gibbon, iv. 327) questions the stories as to further punishments inflicted on the Jews for the atrocities which they had committed under cover of the Persian power.

[o] In addition to my usual authorities I have consulted Sale's 'Koran,' Lond. 1734; Ockley's 'History of the Saracens,' Camb. 1757; White's 'Bampton Lectures for 1784,' Lond. 1811; Möhler, 'Ueber das Verhältniss des Islams zum Evangelium,' in vol. i. of his Essays; Weil's 'Mahommed der Prophet,' Stuttg. 1843; Irving's 'Mahomet and his Successors,' Lond. 1850, 8vo.; Part I. (reaching to the Hegira), of 'The Life of Mahommad,' by Dr. Sprenger, Allahabad, 1851; and 'Remarks on the

have been founded on a belief in the unity of God; but this belief was darkened and practically superseded by a worship of the heavenly bodies, of angels, and of idols.[p] The ancient sanctuary of the nation, the *Caaba*, or holy house of Mecca, contained a number of images answering to that of days in the year.[q] But other religions also existed in Arabia. Judaism had become the faith of some tribes; orthodox Christian missionaries had made converts; and members of various sects, such as Gnostics, Manicheans, Nestorians, and Monophysites, had found a refuge from the unfriendly laws of the empire.[r] Thus there were abundant materials within the reach of any one who might undertake to become the founder of a new system.

The birth of Mahomet has been variously dated, from 569 to 571; perhaps the latest date is to be preferred.[s] His temper was naturally mystical and enthusiastic; he was subject from an early age to fits of epilepsy,[t] which were supposed to proceed from an influence of evil spirits. He appears to have become possessed with a ruling idea of the Divine unity, and with a vehement indignation against idolatry. Every year, according to a custom which was not uncommon among his countrymen, he withdrew to a cave in a mountain, and spent some time in religious solitude; and in his lonely musings he was gradually wrought up to a belief that he was especially called by God to be an instrument for the propagation of the true faith, and was favoured with revelations from heaven.[u] The *Koran*, in which his oracles are preserved, has many points of resemblance both to Judaism and to Christianity; but it would seem that Mahomet was not acquainted with either the Old or the New Testament—that he rather drew his materials from Talmudical legends, from apocryphal Gospels, and other heretical writings, mixed with the old traditions of Arabia.[x] His own account of the work was, that its contents were written from eternity on a table which stands before the throne of God; that a

Character of Mahammad,' by Col. Vans Kennedy, in 'Transactions of the Bombay Literary Society,' iii. 398-448, Lond. 1823. The attempts at a more correct exhibition of the prophet's name are so various, that, so long as no one of them is generally adopted, it appears safest to follow the most unpretending manner of spelling it—a rule which I have usually observed as to other names.

[p] Sale, Introd. 14-21; Gibbon, v. 17-22; Weil, 20. Dr. Sprenger (p. 103) seems to question the monotheistic foundation.

[q] See Koran, c. iii. pp. 47-8; Milman, ii. 17.

[r] Sale, Introd. 22-4; Gibbon, v. 20-1.

[s] See Gibbon, v. 24, with Milman's notes; Weil, 31; Sprenger, 75.

[t] This fact, which has been treated as a calumny of Christian writers (see Schröckh, xix. 348-9), seems to be now established beyond doubt on Arabian authority. See Weil, 42-5; Sprenger, 77-8; Gfrörer, iii. 26-8; Irving, i. 61.

[u] Gibbon, v. 27; Sprenger, 106-111.

[x] White, 268; Kennedy, 428; Milman, ii. 25-6.

copy was brought down by the angel Gabriel to the lowest heaven, and that the sections of it were revealed according as circumstances required.[y] By way of proof that he had not forged these revelations, Mahomet repeatedly insists on the contrast between his own illiteracy and the perfection of the book; he challenges objectors to produce any work either of men or of genii which can be compared with it.[z] The charge of inconsistency between its different parts was guarded against by the convenient principle that a later revelation abrogated so much of the earlier as disagreed with it.[a]

The religion thus announced was *Islam*—a word which means *submission* or *resignation* to the will of God.[b] Its single doctrine was declared to be, that "There is no God but the true God, and Mahomet is his apostle;" but under this principle was comprehended belief in six points—(1) in God; (2) in his angels; (3) in his scriptures; (4) in his prophets; (5) in the resurrection and the day of judgment; (6) in God's absolute decree and predetermination both of good and evil. With these were combined four practical duties—(1) prayer, with its preliminary washings and lustrations; (2) alms; (3) fasting; (4) the pilgrimage to Mecca, which was held so essential that any one who died without performing it might as well die a Jew or a Christian.[c] Judaism and Christianity were recognised as true, but imperfect, religions. Jesus was regarded as the greatest of all former prophets, but the belief in his Godhead was declared to be erroneous; He was said to be a mere man, and his death was explained away, either on the docetic principle, or by the supposition that another person suffered in his stead.[d] Mahomet asserted that he himself had been foretold in Scripture, but that the prophecies had been falsified by those who had the custody of them; his followers, however, claimed some passages of the extant Scriptures in his favour, such as the promise of the Paraclete, and the parable in which the labourers were spoken of as called at various times of the day (St. Matt. xx.)—the final call being to the religion of Islam.[e]

The conception of the Divine majesty in the Koran is sublime; the mercy of God is dwelt on in a very impressive manner. But

[y] Sale, 64; Gibbon, v. 31-3.

[z] Koran, c. x. p. 170; c. xii. p. 176; c. xvii. p. 236; c. xxix. p. 328; and elsewhere.

[a] Ch. xvi. p. 223.

[b] Sale, Introd. 70, and n. on Koran, p. 36; Sprenger, 168-9

[c] Sale, 71-114.

[d] Koran, c. iii. pp. 42-3; c. iv. pp. 80-1; c. v. pp. 92, 98; c. ix. pp. 152-3; c. xix. p. 251; Gibbon, v. 29-30; Weil, 190-3.

[e] Möhler, 353-5.

the absence of anything like the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation places an impassable gulf between the Creator and his creatures; there is no idea of redemption, of mediation, of adoption to sonship with God, of restoration to his image. The omnipotence of God is represented as arbitrary, and as requiring an abject submission to its will.[f] The duty of loving their brethren in the faith is strongly inculcated on the disciples of Islam; but their love is not to extend beyond this brotherhood. In other respects, the new religion was unquestionably a great improvement on that which Mahomet found. It benefited society by substituting a measure of justice for rude violence, and by abolishing the custom of putting female infants to death. The general character of its morality is rather austere than (as it has sometimes been styled) licentious,[g] but it is one of the most damning traits in Mahomet's character, that in this respect he declared himself to be exempt from the restrictions which he imposed on his disciples.[h]

On the merits of that enigmatical character it would be bold to give any confident opinion. The religious enmity by which it was formerly misrepresented appears to have little effect in our own time; we need rather to be on our guard against too favourable judgments, the offspring of a reaction against former prejudices, or of an affectation of novelty and paradox which in some cases appears to be not only deliberate but undisguised. The latest and most complete evidence seems to prove that Mahomet was at first an honest enthusiast;[i] as to the more doubtful part of his career, I must confess myself unable to enter into the views of his admirers; but I will not venture to judge whether he was guilty of conscious imposture, or was blindly carried along by the intoxication of the power which he had acquired and by the lust of extending it.[k]

Mahomet had reached his fortieth year before he announced

[f] See Neander, v. 117-9; Gieseler, I. ii. 468.

[g] It is, however, with some astonishment that I have read Col. Kennedy's words—"Never was a purer religion propagated than his" (p. 429); and I feel myself quite unable to agree with Dean Milman in saying—"Col. Kennedy's appreciation of the prophet is the most just with which I am acquainted." (ii. 14.)

[h] See the Koran, c. xxiii. pp. 348-9; Gibbon, v. 66; Hallam, M. A. i. 476-7; Weil, 400. Dr. Weil gives a false colouring to Mahomet's own license by speaking of it as a confession of weakness. If Mahomet had so represented it, others would have claimed indulgence on the same plea; it was therefore necessarily founded on a pretence of superiority. The caliphs and the rich Mussulmans in general extended the prophet's privilege to themselves. See Milman, ii. 47.

[i] See Sprenger, 185, and elsewhere. Col. Kennedy strongly denies that the prophet was "an enthusiast or fanatic" (pp. 429, 445); but this denial becomes a truism when, after some definition of the word, we are told that "Fanaticism is peculiar to the Christians." (p. 446.)

[k] See Gibbon, v. 63-5; Schröckh, xix. 381; Milman, ii. 13.

1867486

himself as a prophet. At first he made proselytes slowly among his friends and near relations;[m] he then by degrees attempted to publish his opinions in a wider circle. But his pretensions were disbelieved; he and his followers were persecuted by the Koreish, the tribe which was dominant in Mecca and had possession of the Caaba; and in 622 (the year in which Heraclius made his first campaign against the Persians)[n] he fled to Yatreb (Medina),[o] where he had already contrived to form a party, and was received as a prince.[p] This flight (*Hegira*) is regarded as the great era in the prophet's life, and as the foundation of the Mahometan chronology. Hitherto he had endeavoured to spread his opinions by persuasion only; but now that he was possessed of force, he was charged by revelation to use it for the propagation of the faith.[q] His oracles became fierce and sanguinary. From leading his little bands of followers to attack caravans of merchants, he went on, as his strength increased, to more considerable enterprises; and in 630 he gained possession of Mecca, cleansed the Caaba of its idols, erected it into the great sanctuary of Islam, and united all the tribes of Arabia under his own dominion and in the profession of his religion.[r]

When his power had become considerable, Mahomet sent envoys to the emperor, to the king of Persia, and to other neighbouring princes, declaring his mission, and requiring them to submit to the faith of Islam. Heraclius is said to have received the communication with respect; Chosroes contemptuously tore the letter in pieces; and Mahomet, on hearing of the act, exclaimed, "It is thus that God will tear the kingdom, and reject the supplications, of Chosroes."[s]

The duty of fighting for Islam was binding on all but the sick and the feeble, the lame, the blind, and the poor.[t] The fanaticism of the warriors was urged on by the inducements of rapine and of lust (for the restriction as to the number of concubines did not

[m] Weil, 49. Dr. Sprenger thinks that his first adherents were not indebted to him for their religious ideas, but were already in possession of them; that "the Islam is the offspring of the spirit of the time;" that Mahomet did no more than combine "the floating elements which had been imported or originated by others," while he polluted the system with his own "immorality and perverseness of mind." pp. 41, 174-5.

[n] Pagi in Bar. xi. 189.

[o] More properly *Medinet-al-Nabi*, "City of the Prophet."

[p] Gibbon, v. 43-4; Weil, 72-3, 79.

[q] Sale, 48-9, 142; Koran, c. xxii., &c.

[r] Sale, 114; Gibbon, v. 54-7; Weil, 218.

[s] Compare the Koran, c. xxx. p. 430; Sale, 53; Weil, 195, 198-9. The interview with Heraclius was at Emesa, on his return from Persia, in 629 (Gibbon, v. 58); that with Chosroes was earlier, but the date is uncertain. Gibbon, iv. 308.

[t] Koran, c. xlvii.; c. xlviii. p. 414.

apply to captives).[u] They were raised above regard for life by the conviction that they were doing God's will, by the belief of an absolute and irresistible predestination, and by the assurance of bliss in paradise[x]—a bliss which opened to the sensual unlimited gratifications with unlimited powers of enjoyment,[y] while the martyrs and those who should die in the wars of the faith were moreover to enjoy the transcendent and ineffable felicity of beholding the face of God at morning and at evening.[z] Thus animated, the Moslem armies went forth with an enthusiasm which nothing could check. Their immense sacrifices of life in bloody battles and in long sieges were repaired by an unfailing succession of warriors. Before the death of Mahomet, which took place at Medina in 632,[a] Kaled, "the Sword of God," had carried his arms into Syria. The energy of Heraclius was consumed by disease;[b] Syria and Egypt,[c] which he had reconquered from Chosroes, were again wrested from the empire by the new enemy. In 637 Jerusalem fell into the hands of the caliph[d] Omar, who built a mosque on the site of the temple,[e] and within a few years Persia, Khorasan, and part of Asia Minor were subdued. The internal quarrels of the prophet's followers suspended the career of conquest only for a time. For years they threatened Constantinople itself, although their attempts were unsuccessful, and ended in the caliph's submitting to tribute;[f] and by the end of the century they took Carthage and became masters of the African provinces (A.D. 698).[g]

A.D. 668-677.

The progress of the Mahometan arms was favoured by the exhaustion of the empire and of Persia in the course of their recent wars.[h] In Syria and Egypt the greater part of the inhabitants were Nestorians or Monophysites, depressed by the imperial laws, and ready to welcome the enemies of the Byzantine court as deliverers.[i] And the conquerors, although indifferent to the distinctions of Christian parties for their own sake, were glad to encourage and to profit by this feeling. While they drove out the Greek orthodox

[u] Koran, c. xxiii. p. 281; Sale, 145-6.

[x] Sale, 103, 133-7; Gibbon, v. 48-9; Wachsmuth, Allgem. Culturgeschichte, i. 517; Maurice on the Religions of the World, ed. 2, p. 23.

[y] Koran, c. xxxvii. p. 367; c. xliv. p. 403; c. lv. p. 433; c. lvi. pp. 434-5; Gibbon, v. 39-40.

[z] Sale, 100.

[a] Gibbon, v. 61-3; Weil, 331.

[b] Mr. Finlay, i. 431, shows that Gibbon is mistaken in supposing the emperor to have given himself up to indolence.

[c] The charge against Omar, of ordering the Alexandrian library to be burnt, appears to be now *re*-established. See Milman, n. on Gibbon, v. 136-8; Churton in Pearson's Vindic. Ignat. 293.

[d] This word means *successor* (of the prophet).

[e] Ockley, i. 229; Gibbon, v. 123-4; Milman, ii. 41.

[f] Gibbon, v. 174.

[g] Gibbon, v. 142, 150.

[h] Sale, 37; Gibbon, iv. 308; v. 89.

[i] Schröckh, xx. 382-3; Gibbon, v. 132; Finlay, i. 382, 466, 487.

from Egypt, and kept down the Melchites, they favoured the sects which were opposed to Rome and to Constantinople.[k] While war was waged without mercy against idolaters,[m] "the people of the book" —Jews and Christians—as professors of true, although defective, religion, were allowed to live as tributaries in the conquered lands. But the oppressions to which they were subjected,[n] the advantages offered to converts, and perhaps the perplexity of controversies as to Christian doctrine, drew many away from the Gospel to profess the faith of Islam.[o]

About the same time when Mahomet began his career of conquest, a controversy arose which continued for nearly a century to agitate the Church.

Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who is said to have been a Syrian, and connected by family with the Jacobite sect,[p] had met with a letter ascribed to his predecessor Mennas,[q] in which the Saviour was said to have "one will, and one life-giving operation."[r] Struck with the expression, he consulted Theodore, bishop of Pharan, in Arabia, a person of whom nothing is known except in connexion with this controversy, but who, from the reference thus made to him, may be supposed to have enjoyed an eminent character for learning and to have been as yet unsuspected of any error in doctrine.[s] Theodore approved the words; whereupon Sergius adopted them and had some correspondence with other persons on the subject.[t] The doctrine thus started, which was afterwards known as *Monothelism*,[u] is summed up in some words from another of Theodore's writings—that "in the incarnation of our Saviour there is but one operation, whereof the framer and author is God the Word; and that of this the Manhood is the instrument, so that, whatever may be said of Him, whether as God or as man,

About A.D. 616.

[k] Fleury, xxxviii. 55; Neander, v. 122; Ockley, i. 309-310; Gfrörer, ii. 36.

[m] See the Koran, c. ix.—the last-revealed chapter. But Christians are in it charged with idolatry, inasmuch as "they take their priests and monks [*i. e.* saints] for Gods, and Christ, the son of Mary, although they are commanded to worship one God." pp. 152-3.

[n] See the capitulation of Jerusalem, in Milman, ii. 41-2.

[o] Gibbon, v. 31, 172; Schröckh, xix. 370; Gieseler, I. ii. 469-470; Milman, ii. 47.

[p] Mosh. ii. 102. But Walch (ix. 83, 101) questions this.

[q] For Mennas, see vol. i. p. 477-482.

[r] The VIth General Council condemned the letter as spurious, and it was there proved to be wrongly attached to the Acts of the Vth General Council. (Hard. iii. 1067-70; 1312, 1365.) Walch, however, thinks that it may have really been the work of Mennas, ix. 97, 100.

[s] Walch, ix. 151; Neander, v. 250.

[t] Walch, ix. 93-4, 98.

[u] *i. e.* maintaining of a single will only. The name *monothelite* first appears in John of Damascus. Gies. I. ii. 477.

it is all the operation of the Godhead of the Word."[v] In opposition to this, it was contended that the faculty of willing is inherent in each of our Lord's natures, although, as His person is one, the two wills act in the same direction—the human will being exercised in accordance with the Divine.[x]

Heraclius, in the course of his Persian wars, saw cause to regret the policy by which the Nestorians had been alienated from the empire,[y] and to desire that the evils which were likely to result from the schism of the Monophysites might be averted. He conferred with some of their leaders—as Paul, the chief of the party in Armenia, and Athanasius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, to whom it is said that he offered the Catholic throne of that city on condition of accepting the council of Chalcedon. The Monophysites had gradually become less averse from the substance of that council's doctrine;[z] and Heraclius was led to hope that the schism might be healed if the Catholics would grant that, although our Lord had two natures, yet He had only one will and operation.[a] When in Lazica, in the year 626, the emperor related the course of the affair to Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, who, as the question was new to him, wrote to ask the opinion of Sergius. He was told, in reply, that the Church had pronounced no decision on the point; that Cyril of Alexandria and other approved fathers had spoken of "one life-giving operation of Christ, our very God;" that Mennas had used similar expressions; that he was mistaken in supposing Leo the Great to have taught two operations, and that Sergius was not aware of any other authority for so speaking.[b] Cyrus was convinced by this letter. He was soon after promoted to the patriarchate of Alexandria, and in 633 effected a reconciliation of the Theodosians, a Monophysite sect, with the Church, by means of a compromise which was embodied in nine articles.[c] In the seventh of these it was said that our Lord "wrought the acts appertaining both to God and to man by one *theandric* (*i. e.* divinely-human) operation"—an expression for which the authority of the writings ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite was alleged.[d] The

A.D. 622.

A.D. 630.

[v] Hard. iii. 768.

[x] Dorner, ii. 259-260.

[y] See vol. i. p. 417.

[z] See vol. i. p. 465.

[a] Theophanes, 506; Pagi, xi. 219, 243-5 (who questions the story of Athanasius); Dupin, vi. 58; Walch, ix. 75-80, 90, 104, 109, 151; Schröckh, xx. 387-390; Neander, v. 243; Gfrörer, iii. 42.

[b] Hard. iii. 1309, 1337; Walch, ix. 106.

[c] Hard. iii. 1340-4.

[d] See Dorner, ii. 200-4, 235. The Catholics did not object to the term *theandric*, but to the statement that the operation was *simple*. (Pagi, xi. 275-4.) In the passage of Dionysius, they read "*a new* theandric operation" (καινὴ instead of μία—Gieseler, I. ii. 471). But,

Monophysites regarded the terms of union as matter of triumph. "It is not we," they said, "who have gone over to the council of Chalcedon; it is the council that has come over to us."[e]

Sophronius, a learned monk, who was then at Alexandria, was greatly alarmed on seeing the articles. He uttered a loud cry, threw himself at the patriarch's feet, and, with a profusion of tears, implored him, by the Saviour's passion, not to sanction such Apollinarian doctrines.[f] Cyrus proposed to refer the matter to Sergius, and gave Sophronius a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople. Although himself a Monothelite, Sergius did not consider agreement in his opinion necessary as a condition of orthodoxy. In conversation with Sophronius, he dwelt on the importance of regaining the Monophysites throughout the Egyptian patriarchate; he asked the monk to produce any express authority for speaking of *two* operations in Christ; and, as Sophronius could not do this, the patriarch obtained from him a promise to let the question rest. Sergius then wrote to Cyrus, desiring him to forbid all discussion on the subject, lest the late union of parties should be endangered.[g]

In the following year, Sophronius became patriarch of Jerusalem. He seems to have felt that he was thus released from his promise—that the silence which might have been proper in a humble monk would be treachery to the truth in the occupant of a patriarchal throne.[h] On hearing of his elevation, Sergius took the alarm, and, without waiting for the formal announcement of it, wrote to Honorius of Rome, detailing the previous history of the question.[i] Honorius, in his answer,[k] echoed the opinions of his correspondent; he not only agreed with him as to the expediency of enforcing silence, but in a personal profession of Monothelism:—"We confess," he says, "one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, forasmuch as it is evident that that which was assumed by the Godhead was our nature, not the sin which is in it—our nature as it was created before sin, not as it was corrupted by transgression."[m] After discussing St. Paul's words as to the will of the flesh and the will of the mind, he con- A.D. 634.

although this reading was correct, the singular number and the epithet "new" were in favour of the Monothelites. Dorner, ii. 208.

[e] Fleury, xxxvii. 42.

[f] Maximus ap. Baron. xi. 647.

[g] Serg. ad Honor. ap. Hard. iii. 1316.

[h] Neander, v. 247.

[i] Hard. iii. 1312-7.

[k] Hard. iii. 1320-2.

[m] Col. 1320 D. The answer is obvious—that as a part of the sinless nature He took the innocent human will, and had this jointly with the Divine will. See Dorner, ii. 232.

cludes that the Saviour had not the fleshly will; and he spoke of the question as to two operations as one fit only for grammarians.[n] Sophronius, in his enthronistic letter, set forth very fully, and with great ability, the doctrine of the Incarnation, with special reference to the controversy which had arisen.[o] He admits the word *theandric*, but applies it to the joint action of both natures in the Divinely-human Person—an application different from that in which it had been used by Sergius and his partisans.[p] Honorius obtained from the envoys who conveyed this letter to Rome a promise that their master would give up speaking of two wills, if Cyrus would cease to speak of one will; but the controversy was not to be so easily appeased.[q]

The siege and capture of Jerusalem by the Arabs may be supposed to have soon after engrossed the attention of Sophronius; and he did not long survive.[r] But some time before his death he led Stephen, bishop of Dor, the first of his suffragans, to Calvary, and there, in the most solemn manner, charged him, by the thoughts of the crucifixion and of the last judgment, to go to Rome, and never to rest until he should have obtained a condemnation of the Monothelite doctrine.[s]

A D. 637.

The distractions of the church continued, and in 639, Heraclius, unwarned by the ill success of his predecessors in such measures, put forth an edict which bore the title of *Ecthesis*, or Exposition of the faith. This step was suggested by Sergius, and the document was of his composition.[t] After stating the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, it proceeded to settle the controversy by forbidding the discussion of the question as to one or two operations. All operation suitable either to God or to man (it was said) proceeds from the same one incarnate Word. To speak of a single operation, although the phrase had been used by some fathers, caused trouble to *some*; to speak of two operations, was an expression unsupported by any authority of approved teachers, and gave offence to *many*, as suggesting the idea of two opposite wills. Even the impious Nestorius, although he divided the Person of the Saviour, had not spoken of two wills; one will was to be confessed, agreeably to the doctrine of the holy fathers,

[n] Baronius boldly attempts to justify Honorius (633. 32. seqq.). Pagi gives up the pope's language and conduct, but maintains his personal orthodoxy, xi. 285-298, 390-2. See Walch, ix. 125-6; Schröckh, xx. 402; Döllinger, i. 157.

[o] Hard. iii. 1257-96.

[p] Col. 1280 B. See Dorner, ii. 214.

[q] Schröckh, xx. 406.

[r] Theophanes, 520; Pagi, xi. 314.

[s] This was stated by Stephen at the Council of Lateran, Hard. iii. 713.

[t] Walch, ix. 139-141.

forasmuch as the Saviour's manhood never produced any motion contrary to the inclination of His Godhead.[u] Even if the Ecthesis had not in its substance been thus evidently partial to the Monothelites, no satisfactory result could have been reasonably expected from a document which aimed at putting an end to differences by concealing them, or from a policy which, in silencing both parties, necessarily favoured the more subservient, while it was galling to the more zealous.

The Ecthesis was approved by councils at Constantinople under Sergius and his successor Pyrrhus, and at Alexandria under Cyrus.[x] The patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, suffering under the oppression of the Arabs, were in no condition to oppose it. But Honorius of Rome was dead; his successor, Severinus (whose pontificate lasted only two months, and was chiefly remarkable for the plunder of the papal treasures by the exarch of Ravenna[y]), appears to have rejected the new formulary;[z] and the next pope, John IV., with a council, certainly did so. Heraclius hereupon wrote to John, disowning the authorship of the Ecthesis; it had, he said, been composed by Sergius some years before, and he had only consented to issue it at the patriarch's urgent entreaty.[a] A.D. 640.

Heraclius died in February 641, leaving the empire jointly to Constantine, son of his first marriage, and to Heracleonas, the offspring of his second marriage with his niece Martina.[b] Constantine died within little more than three months, and Martina attempted to rule in the name of her son; but the senate, backed by the army and by the inhabitants of the capital, deposed her and Heracleonas, as guilty of the death of Constantine, whose son, Constans II., was then set on the throne.[c] On this the patriarch Pyrrhus, who had been a partisan of Martina, thought it expedient to abandon his dignity, and sought a refuge in Africa.[d] There he met with Maximus, a man of noble Byzantine family, who, after having been a secretary of state under Heraclius, had embraced the monastic profession, and became the ablest controversialist in opposition to Monothelism.[e] In 645, a disputation was held between the two, in the presence of Gregory, governor of

[u] Hard. iii. 796.
[x] Hard. iii. 798-804; Pagi, xi. 336.
[y] Chosen, A.D. 538; confirmed and died, 640. Milman, ii. 126-7.
[z] See Walch, xi. 145-8.
[a] Maximus, ap. Baron. xi. 640-9; Walch, ix. 199.
[b] This incestuous union is placed in 613 by Baronius (613. 3). See Pagi, xi. 119.
[c] Gibbon, iv. 400-2.
[d] Theophanes, 508: Gibbon, iv. 402.
[e] Baron. 640. 5; Dupin, vi. 43; Walch, ix. 194.

the province, and of many bishops and other eminent persons.[f] Pyrrhus started with the proposition that, as the Saviour's person is one, He could have but one will; Maximus replied that, as He is both God and man, each of His natures must have its proper will. The discussion was long, and was carried on with much acuteness. Maximus was evidently the superior in ability and in dialectic skill, and at length Pyrrhus avowed himself convinced. He accompanied Maximus to Rome, where the pope, Theodore, admitted Pyrrhus to communion, and treated him as patriarch of Constantinople. But Pyrrhus soon after went to Ravenna, and there, probably under the influence of the exarch, retracted his late professions. On hearing this, Theodore held a council, at which Pyrrhus was condemned and excommunicated; and, in order to give all solemnity to the sentence, the pope subscribed it in the wine of the eucharistic cup, and laid it on the tomb of St. Peter.[g]

A.D. 645.

Both John IV.[h] and Theodore had urged the successive emperors to withdraw the Ecthesis, which was still placarded by authority. In 648, Constans put forth a new document, which was intended to supersede the Ecthesis, and is known by the name of the *Type* (i. e. *model* or *formulary* of faith). The author of this was the patriarch Paul, the successor of Pyrrhus. Its tone is less theological than that of the Ecthesis. While, like the earlier form, it forbade the discussion of the controversy, and the use of the obnoxious terms on both sides, it did so without expressing a partiality for either side; and it enacted severe punishments against all who should break the rule of silence.[i]

Paul had carried on some unsatisfactory correspondence with Rome on the subject of the controversy, when at length Theodore, with a council, declared him excommunicate. On hearing the sentence, he overthrew the altar of the papal chapel at Constantinople; he forbade the Roman envoys to celebrate the Eucharist, treated them with harshness, and persecuted their partisans.[k] The controversy raged more and more fiercely, notwithstanding the publication of the Type. Maximus was unceasing and indefatigable in his exertions to stir up opposition to the

[f] Printed at the end of Baronius, vol. xi. See Döllinger, i. 159; Neander, v. 255; Dorner, ii. 222-3.

[g] Theophanes, 509; Anastas. 138-9. It afterwards became usual, in signing solemn documents, to make the sign of the cross "calamo in pretioso Christi sanguine intincto." Ducange, in voc. *Crux*, t. ii. p. 679. See Martene, i. 253.

[h] Hard. iii. 614.

[i] Hard. iii. 824-5; Baron. 648. 1, and Pagi's notes; Walch, ix. 216; Schröckh, xx. 423; Neander, v. 255-6; Döllinger, i. 160.

[k] Hard. iii. 709.

Monothelite doctrines; and Rome was beset by applications from African councils, from Greece, and from other quarters, to act in defence of the faith.[m]

Theodore was succeeded by Martin in July, 649, and in October of the same year the new pope held a synod which, from having been held in a church adjoining the Lateran palace, is known as the First Lateran Council. It was attended by a hundred and five bishops, among whom was the bishop of Ravenna.[n] In the course of five sessions the history of the controversy was discussed, and the chief documents of it were examined. Passages from the writings of the leading Monothelites were confronted with extracts from Catholic fathers,[o] and were paralleled with the language of notorious heretics.[p] The Type of Constans was said to place truth and error on the same level, to "destroy the righteous with the wicked;"[q] to leave Christ without will and operation, and therefore without substance and nature.[r] It was declared that there are in the Saviour two natural wills and operations, the Divine and the human,—"The same one Lord Jesus Christ willing and operating our salvation both as God and as man."[s] Among the contents of the twenty canons, the doctrine of two united wills and of two operations was laid down, and an anathema was uttered against all who should deny it.[t] The expression "*one* theandric operation" was denounced,[u] and anathemas were passed against Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, with the "most impious Ecthesis" and the "most impious Type," which Sergius and Paul respectively had persuaded Heraclius and the reigning emperor to issue.[x]

Martin followed up this council by announcing its decisions to the emperor, to the patriarchs, to the bishops of Africa, and other persons.[y] Among his letters is one to Amandus, bishop of Mastricht, urging him to get the condemnation of Monothelism taken up by a Frankish council, and to obtain the aid of King Sigebert in the affair. The pope's language throughout these

[m] Hard. iii. 702, 720, 728, 738, &c.; Walch, ix. 208; Neander, v. 257.

[n] The Acts, in Hardouin, iii. 687, seqq., embody some documents already quoted.

[o] Hard. iii. 771, seqq.; 853, seqq. As the pseudo-Dionysian writings were quoted, Baronius takes occasion to inveigh against the "perfrictam frontem recentiorum hæreticorum," who have impugned them. 649. 19.

[p] Hard. iii. 783., seqq., 891 seqq.

[q] Hard. iii. 825.

[r] Hard. iii. 700-717.

[s] Hard. iii. 920-1.

[t] Can. x. xiv. (Hard. iii. 921-6).

[u] Can. xv. See above, p. 38, note [d].

[x] Can. xviii.

[y] Hard. iii. 625-34, 655, 933, &c.

letters is in a tone of extreme denunciation, although he may perhaps have thought to guard himself against the emperor's resentment by professions of great reverence for his person, and by referring the Ecthesis and the Type to Sergius and Paul as their authors.[z]

While the council was sitting, the exarch Olympius arrived at Rome, with instructions to enforce the signature of the Type, and, if possible, to carry off the pope to Constantinople. He did not, however, execute his commission, probably because he meditated a revolt, and was willing to pay court to the papal party; and he was soon after killed in Sicily in an expedition against the Saracens.[a] Martin, notwithstanding the fresh provocation which he had given to the court, appears to have been left in peace for three years and a half, until a new exarch, Theodore Calliopas, appeared, carried him off from Rome, and despatched him towards the eastern capital. The tedious journey lasted from the 19th of June, 653, to the 17th of September in the following year. The pope was treated without any consideration for his office, his age, or the weakness of his health. Although his conductors often landed for recreation, he was never allowed to leave the vessel except at Naxos, where he remained a year on shore, but debarred from such comfort as he might have received from the visits or from the presents of his friends. On reaching Constantinople he lay for a day on the deck of the vessel, exposed to the mockery of the spectators who crowded the quay; and he was then removed to a prison, where he remained six months.[b] During this time he was subjected to repeated examinations, which, however, did not relate to charges of erroneous doctrine, but to political offences, such as an alleged connexion with Olympius, and even with the Saracens. He was paraded about the streets as a criminal sentenced to death; and he would probably have been executed but for the intercession of the patriarch Paul, who was then dying, and, on receiving a visit from the emperor, expressed his fear lest this unworthy treatment of a bishop opposed to him might tell against him on the judgment-day.[c] Martin, who had borne his trials with much dignity and courage, was then banished to Cherson,[d] where he

[z] Schröckh, xx. 430.

[a] Anastas. 139; Baron. 649. 49-51; Pagi, xi. 423.

[b] Accounts by Martin himself and another, in Hardouin, iii. 673, seqq., 688; Pagi, xi. 431, 451-3.

[c] Hard. iii. 683.

[d] The ancient Cherson was near Sebastopol, a place which, since this chapter was written, has become memorable in our own history. It was the seat of a Greek republic, which preserved its independence until the emperor Theophilus compelled it to receive a governor from Constantinople. See Finlay, ii. 415.

lingered for a time in want of the necessaries of life. Two letters are extant in which he pathetically complains of the neglect in which he was left by his flock, and by the many who had formerly partaken of his bounty.[e] In this exile he died, in September 655.[f]

Maximus, the most learned and most indefatigable opponent of Monothelism, was carried to Constantinople with two disciples in the same year with Martin[g] (A.D. 653). The three were kept in prison until after the banishment of the pope, and were then brought to examination. Against Maximus, too, an attempt was made to establish a political crime by the charge of a connexion with Gregory, governor of Africa, who had revolted. But the accusations were chiefly of a theological or ecclesiastical kind. Among other things, it was imputed to him that he had offended against the imperial privileges by denying that the emperor possessed the priesthood; by uttering an anathema against the Type, which was construed into anathematising the emperor himself; and by denying that the imperial confirmation gave validity to canons. To these heads he answered, that the emperor could not be a priest, inasmuch as he did not administer the sacraments, and was spoken of as a layman in the offices of the church; that his anathema against the Type applied only to the false doctrine which it contained; and that, if councils became valid by the emperor's confirmation, it would be necessary to receive the Arian councils to which such sanction had been given.[h] Maximus and his companions were inflexible in their opinions, although kindness as well as severity was employed in order to influence them, and although they were pressed by the authority of the new pope, Eugenius, who had complied with the wishes of the court.[i] They were sent into exile at Bizya in Thrace; thence they were again carried to Constantinople, where they were subjected to a fresh examination. Their invincible constancy was punished by the loss of their tongues and of their right hands, and they were banished to Lazica. After a time they were separated; Maximus sank under the cruel treatment which he received in August 662;[k] one of his disciples (who both bore the name of Anastasius) is said, notwithstanding his mutilations, to have still done much for the faith both by speech and by active correspondence until his death in 666.[m] April, 655.

[e] Hard. iii. 686-8.
[f] Pagi, xi. 464.
[g] Pagi, xi. 435.
[h] Baron. 650. 25-32; 656. 13; 657. 7-11; Schröckh, xx. 432; Walch, ix. 305-6; Neander, v. 265.
[i] Walch, ix. 312.
[k] Pagi, xi. 503-4.
[m] Pagi, xi. 519-20; Fleury, xxxix. 38.

The emperor, by whose authority these barbarous proceedings were sanctioned, had put his own brother to death, and by this and other acts had provoked the detestation of his eastern subjects. Yielding to the general feeling, he withdrew from Constantinople in the year 663, and visited Rome, where he was received with great honour by the bishop, Vitalian.[n] After stripping off the brazen roof of the Pantheon (which had been a church since the reign of Phocas), and plundering it and other churches of their precious ornaments, he withdrew to Syracuse, where he was murdered in 668.[o] The fate of pope Martin had disposed his successors, Eugenius and Vitalian, to peaceful courses; and the con-

A.D. 672-677. troversy smouldered until Adeodatus, the successor of Vitalian, again broke off communion with Constantinople,[p] whereupon the patriarchs Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch excited a commotion by attempting to strike out of their diptychs the name of Vitalian, the only recent pope who had been commemorated in them.[q]

The son and successor of Constans, Constantine, who is styled *Pogonatus* (the Bearded), was distressed by the divisions of the Church, and resolved to attempt a remedy. He wrote to Donus,

A.D. 678. bishop of Rome, desiring him to send some delegates to Constantinople, for the purpose of conferring on the subjects in dispute.[r] Before this letter arrived at Rome, Donus

June, 678. had been succeeded by Agatho, who, on receiving it, assembled a council. Among the hundred and twenty-five prelates who attended it were Mansuetus of Milan, two Frankish

A.D. 680. bishops and the famous Wilfrid of York; the rest were subjects of the empire.[s] Monothelism was condemned, and two prelates with a deacon were sent to Constantinople as representatives of the pope, while the council was represented by three bishops, with other clerks and monks.[t] Agatho furnished his envoys with a letter to the emperor, which was intended to serve a like purpose with Leo's letter to Flavian in the Eutychian controversy;[u] he expresses regret that the unquiet circumstances of Italy prevent the possibility of deep theological study, and professes to rely, not on the learning of his deputies, but on their faithfulness to the doctrine of earlier councils and fathers.[x]

[n] Baronius makes amusing excuses for this, 663. 3-5.

[o] Theophanes, 538; Anastas. 141; Pagi, xi. 531; Gibbon, iv. 403.

[p] Neander, v. 266. [q] Walch, ix. 376.

[r] Hard. iii. 1043-7.

[s] Dupin, v. 61; Schröckh, xx. 437. See Inett, i. 92, seqq. Pagi places the council in 679; Jaffé, in March, 680.

[t] Hard. iii. 1076-7.

[u] Dorner, ii. 229, 248. See vol. i. p. 423, 431.

[x] Hard. iii. 1077.

Constantine now resolved, instead of the conference which had been intended, to summon an "ecumenical" synod, by which term it would seem that he meant one which should represent the whole *empire;* for no subjects of other governments were present.[y] This assembly—the Sixth General Council, and Third Council of Constantinople[z]—met in a room of the palace, which, from its domed roof, was styled *Trullus.*[a] The sessions were eighteen in number, and lasted from November 7th, 680, to September 16th in the following year. The emperor presided in person at the first eleven sessions and at the last;[b] in his absence, the presidential chair was unoccupied. The number of bishops was at first small, but gradually rose to nearly two hundred.[c] George, patriarch of Constantinople, appeared, with Macarius of Antioch (whose dignity was little better than titular);[d] while the sees of Alexandria and Jerusalem were represented by two presbyters. Twelve high officers of the empire, and some monks, were also present.[e]

The proceedings were conducted with a decency and an impartiality of which there had been little example in former assemblies of the kind, and the emperor sustained his part in a very creditable manner.[f] The principal documents of the controversy were read, and extracts from the writings of the Monothelites were compared with passages intended to refute or to support them, or to prove their identity in substance with heresies already condemned.[g] At the eighth session, the patriarch of Constantinople professed his adhesion to the views of Agatho and the Roman synod, and the bishops of his patriarchate followed the example.[h] But Macarius still maintained the doctrine of a single theandric will and operation—that, as the mind moves the body, so in Christ the divine will directed the humanity.[i] He produced a collection of authorities in favour of his opinion; but the council, after examining these, pronounced them to be spurious or garbled, or, where genuine, to be misapplied,—as when words which had really been used to express the relations of the Divine Persons in the Trinity

March 7, 681.

[y] Hard. iii. 1049; Walch, ix. 391.

[z] The sixth is the last which any Anglican writers acknowledge as a General Council.

[a] Hard. iii. 1055. On the word, see Baron. 680. 41; and Pagi's notes.

[b] Pighius, a Romanist, ventures to call the Acts in question on account of the part thus ascribed to the emperor! Walch, ix. 388-9.

[c] Mosh. ii. 107.

[d] See Gieseler, I. ii. 470.

[e] Hard. iii. 1056.

[f] Walch, ix. 428; Schröckh, xx. 445; Gieseler, I. ii. 475.

[g] Hard. iii. 1152-4; 1202, seqq.; 1226-1304.

[h] Hard. iii. 1157, 1163-6.

[i] Hard. iii. 1171; Dorner, ii. 207. Macarius held that this was consistent with the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures, inasmuch as the one nature was active, and the other was a passive instrument. Dorner, ii. 231.

were transferred to the relations of the Saviour's Godhead and manhood.[k] As Macarius persisted in his opinion, declaring that he could not abandon it even on pain of being cut in pieces and cast into the sea, he was deposed and excommunicated, with a disciple named Stephen, and, while the emperor was hailed as a new Constantine the Great, a new Theodosius, a new Marcian, anathemas were loudly uttered against Macarius as a second Apollinaris and Dioscorus.[m]

The fifteenth session was marked by a singular incident. An aged monk named Polychronius presented a confession of faith, and undertook to prove its correctness by raising a dead man to life. He said that he had seen a vision, in which a person of dazzling brightness and of terrible majesty had told him that whosoever did not confess a single will and theandric operation was not to be acknowledged as a Christian. The synod adjourned to the court of a public bath, and a corpse was brought in on a bier. Polychronius laid his creed on the dead man's breast, and for a long time whispered into his ears; but no miracle followed. The multitude, who had been admitted to witness this strange experiment, shouted out anathemas against Polychronius as a deceiver and a new Simon; but his confidence in his opinions was unshaken by his failure, and the synod found it necessary to depose him.[n] April 26, 681.

The faith on the subject in dispute was at length defined. The Monothelites were condemned as holding a heresy akin to those of Apollinaris, Severus, and Themistius; as destroying the perfection of our Lord's humanity by denying it a will and an operation.[o] The doctrine of the Incarnation was laid down, according to the earlier decisions of the church; and to this it was added,—"We in like manner, agreeably to the teaching of the holy fathers, declare that in Him there are two natural wills and two natural operations, without division, change, separation, or confusion: and these two natural wills are not contrary, as impious heretics pretend; but the human follows the divine and almighty will, not resisting or opposing it, but rather being subject to it; for, according to the most wise Athanasius, it was needful that the will of his flesh should be moved, but that it should be subjected to his divine will. . . . As his flesh, although deified, was not destroyed by his Godhead, so too his human will, although deified, was not destroyed."[p] . . . An anathema was pronounced against the chief leaders of the

[k] Hard. iii. 1149, 1175, seqq.
[m] Hard. iii. 1166, 1175, 1182, 1198, 1327-8, 1413.
[n] Hard. iii. 1374-8.
[o] Hard. 1398-9.
[p] Hard. iii. 1400.

Monothelites. The memory of Honorius had been spared by the Roman councils—a fact which significantly proves that they did not approve of the part which he had taken in the controversy. John IV. in his letter to Constantine, the son of Heraclius, had endeavoured to clear his predecessor by the plea that he had only meant to deny the existence of two *contrary* wills in the Saviour, "forasmuch as in His humanity the will was not corrupted as it is in ours;"[q] and Maximus, in his conference with Pyrrhus, had been unwilling to give the Monothelites the benefit of a Roman bishop's authority.[r] But the general council, after examining the letters of Honorius, declared that "in all things he had followed the opinions of Sergius and had sanctioned his impious doctrines;" and he was included in its anathema.[s]

The decisions of the council were confirmed by the emperor, and severe penalties were enacted against all who should contravene them.[t] Agatho died soon after, and was succeeded by Leo II., who exerted himself to procure the reception of the council by the churches of the west. In letters to the emperor, to the Spanish bishops, and to others, Leo expressed his approval of the condemnation of Honorius, on the ground that that pope, instead of "purifying the Apostolic Church by the doctrine of apostolical tradition, yielded its spotlessness to be defiled by profane betrayal of the faith."[u]

[q] Hard. iii. 611. Against this plea, see Walch, ix. 127-132.

[r] Baron. xi. 645.

[s] Hard. iii. 1331-4. The condemnation of Honorius has caused great difficulty to some Roman controversialists. Baronius pretends that the acts of the council are interpolated, and that the name of Honorius has been substituted in them for that of Theodore, the predecessor of George in the patriarchate of Constantinople (681. 13-21; 682. 4). The groundlessness of this is shown by Pagi, who himself maintains that Honorius was personally orthodox, and that he was condemned only on account of his "economy" in attempting to stifle the discussion of the question (xi. 31-32). Bellarmine, Noël Alexandre (x. 463-8), and others take a similar line, and are refuted by Walch, ix. 409-418; Schröckh, xx. 446-8; Gieseler, I. ii. 477-8; Dorner, ii. 217-220. In our own time, Döllinger gives up Honorius, although he wishes to suppose that he thought more soundly than he expressed himself (i. 157-8); and even Rohrbacher can only excuse the pope by representing him as the dupe of Sergius, and concludes his remarks on the subject by saying that "Nous y voyons un avertissement divin à tous ses successeurs, de bien peser les paroles de leurs écrits, et de ne jamais traiter légèrement les questions de doctrine" (x. 88, 167-8, 381).

[t] Hard. iii. 1445-1457.

[u] Hard. iii. 1476. So he elsewhere says that Honorius "flammam haereticí dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit" (1730). Baronius has recourse to his familiar device of declaring the letters to be forged (683. 14). Pagi owns their genuineness, but says that Honorius is only censured in them for supineness and connivance—not for heresy. But, even if Leo's words did not necessarily imply more than this, his meaning certainly went further, since he unreservedly recommends the decisions of the council, and names Honorius with Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, &c., among those who were condemned as traitors to the faith (1730).

The last two general councils, unlike those of earlier times, had confined themselves to matters of faith, and had not passed any canons relating to other subjects. In order to supply this defect, Justinian II., who in 685 succeeded his father Constantine Pogonatus,[x] assembled a new synod, which is known as the *Trullan*, from having been held in the same domed hall with the late general council, or as the *Quinisext*, from its character of a supplement to the fifth and sixth councils.[y] Its hundred and two canons were subscribed by the emperor and by the four eastern patriarchs; and immediately after the imperial signature, a space was left for that of Sergius, bishop of Rome. It does not appear whether Sergius had been invited to send special deputies to the council;[z] his two ordinary representatives at Constantinople signed the canons, and Basil, metropolitan of Gortyna, in Crete, professed to sign as representing the whole synod of the Roman Church.[a] But among the canons were six which offended the pope, as inconsistent with the rights or the usages of his Church.[b] The ii[nd], in enumerating the earlier canons which were *exclusively* to be observed, sanctioned eighty-five under the name of apostolical, whereas Rome admitted only fifty; and it omitted many synods which were of authority in the west, together with the whole body of papal decretals. The xiii[th] allowed those of the clergy who had married before their ordination as subdeacons to retain their wives.[c] The xxxvi[th] renewed the decrees of the second and fourth general councils as to the privileges of the see of Constantinople. The lv[th] ordered that the "apostolical" canon which forbade fasting on any Saturday except Easter-eve should be extended to Rome, where all the Saturdays of Lent had until then been fast-days. The lxvii[th] forbade the eating of blood. The lxxxii[nd] ordered that the Saviour should be represented in his human form, and not under the symbolical figure of a lamb.[d] In contradicting Roman usages, the xiii[th] and lv[th] canons expressly stated that they were such, and required the Roman Church to abandon them; it would seem, indeed, as if the eastern bishops were bent, as at Chalcedon, on

[x] Gibbon, iv. 405.

[y] The most probable date is 691 (Pagi, xii. 120). Some place it in 692 (see Walch, ix. 44); Hardouin, as late as 706.

[z] Schröckh, xix. 509.

[a] Hard. iii. 1697-9. On these signatures see Pagi, xii. 122; De Marca, V. x. 3.

[b] Schröckh, xix. 508; Gieseler, I. ii. 480.

[c] From this time the bishops of the Greek church were chosen from among the monks. Finlay, ii. 113.

[d] "MM. Raoul-Rochette and Didron observe, that the council wished to effect an entire substitution of history for symbolism" (Lord Lindsay on Christian Art, i. 72), and from about this time Raoul-Rochette dates the introduction of the crucifix, ibid. 91.

moderating the triumph of Rome in the late doctrinal question by regulations unpalatable to the pope as to other matters;[e] and the recognition of these canons by the east only, where they were quoted as the work of the sixth general council, was the first manifest step towards the separation of the Greek and Latin Churches.[f]

On receiving the canons, Sergius declared that he would rather die than consent to them. The protospathary Zacharias was commissioned to seize him and send him to Constantinople. But a rising of the people, and even of the soldiery, who looked more to the bishop of Rome than to their distant imperial master, compelled Zacharias in abject terror to seek the protection of his intended prisoner.[g] About the same time, the vices of Justinian, the exorbitant taxation which was required to feed his expenses, and the cruelties which were committed in his name by his ministers, the eunuch Stephen and the monk Theodotus, provoked a revolt, by which a general named Leontius was raised to the throne. From regard for the memory of Constantine Pogonatus, Leontius spared the life of Justinian;[h] but, according to a practice which had become common in the east, the deposed emperor's nose was cut off, and he was banished to the inhospitable Chersonese.[i] A.D. 695.

Leontius, after a reign of three years, was put down by Tiberius Apsimar, and was committed to a monastery. Justinian, feeling himself unsafe in the place of his exile, sought a refuge amongst the Chazars of the Ukraine, and married a sister of their prince. But even among those remote barbarians, he was in danger from the negotiations of Apsimar; he was driven by desperation to attempt the recovery of his throne, and the attempt was successful. While crossing the Euxine in a violent storm, his companions exhorted him, as a means of obtaining deliverance, to promise that, if restored to the empire, he would forgive his enemies. He replied by vowing unrelenting vengeance against every one of them; and the vow was terribly fulfilled. Leontius was brought forth from his monastery; he and Apsimar were laid prostrate in the circus, and, as the emperor looked on the games, his feet pressed the necks of his fallen rivals, while the multitude A.D. 705.

[e] Gieseler, I. ii. 479.

[f] Gieseler, I. ii. 481. Pope John VIII. (A.D. 872-892) sanctioned such of the Trullan canons as were not contrary to the Roman decrees or canons, or to good morals. Pagi, xii. 128. See the Preface to Theodore the Studite, in Sirmondi Opera Varia, V. b. c., and Nat. Alexand. x. 473, seqq.

[g] Anastas. 149.

[h] Schlosser questions this motive, but seemingly without reason, 109.

[i] Theophanes, 562-6.

shouted the words of the xci[st] Psalm—"Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder." The two were then dragged about the streets of the city, and at length were beheaded.[k] All who had taken part in the expulsion of Justinian were mercilessly punished; many of them were tied up in sacks, and were cast into the sea. The patriarch Callinicus, who had been driven by the tyrant's oppression to favour the rebellion of Leontius, was deprived of his eyes and nose, and was banished to Rome.[m] For some unknown reason, the archbishop of Ravenna was blinded, deposed, and sent into exile in Pontus; and Constantine of Rome—the seventh refugee from the Mahometan conquests who successively filled the see—might well have trembled when in 710 he was summoned to Constantinople. Perhaps Justinian may have required his presence with a view of enforcing the Trullan Council on the west;[n] perhaps he may have meant to secure his own authority in Italy against a repetition of such scenes as that which had taken place in the time of Sergius.[o] But Constantine's ready and courageous obedience appears to have disarmed him. He received the pope as an equal; it is even said that, at the first meeting, he fell down and kissed his feet;[p] and Constantine returned home with a confirmation of all the privileges of his Church. It has been conjectured that these favours were not obtained without the pope's consenting to the canons of the Quinisext council in so far as they were not directly contrary to the Roman traditions.[q]

Justinian's abuse of his recovered power excited his subjects to a fresh revolt, which began by an outbreak of the Chersonites, on whom he had intended to avenge by an exemplary cruelty some disrespect shown to him during his exile.[r] In 711 he was again dethroned and was put to death. His son Tiberius, who had been crowned Augustus, fled to a church, hung the relics which were regarded as most sacred around his neck, and clasped the altar with one hand and the cross with the other. A leader of the insurgents pursued him into the sanctuary, plucked the cross from him, transferred the relics to his own neck, and dragged the boy to the door of the church, where he was immediately slain. Thus ended the dynasty of Heraclius, about an hundred years after the accession of its founder.[s]

[k] Theophanes, 574; Schlosser, 110-4.
[m] Pagi, xii. 191; Gibbon, iv. 406-8.
[n] Milman, ii. 142.
[o] Gieseler, I. ii. 488.
[p] Anastas. 153. Dean Milman regards this as a western fiction, ii. 142.
[q] Anast. 153; Pagi, xii. 220; Schröckh, xix. 514-5.
[r] Baron. 710-4; Schlosser, 119-123.
[s] Theophanes, 583; Gibbon, iv. 408-9; Schlosser, 124-5.

The new emperor, Bardanes, who took the name of Philippicus, was of a Monothelite family, and his early impressions in favour of the heresy had been confirmed by the lessons of Stephen, the associate of Macarius of Antioch.[t] It is said that, many years before, Bardanes had been told by a hermit of the sect that he was one day to be emperor, and that he had vowed, if the prophecy should be fulfilled, to abrogate the Sixth General Council.[u] He refused to enter the palace of Constantinople until a picture of the council should have been removed. He publicly burnt the original copy of its acts, ordered the names of Honorius, Sergius, and the others whom it had condemned, to be inserted in the diptychs,[x] ejected the patriarch Cyrus, and required the bishops to subscribe a Monothelite creed. The order was generally obeyed in the east, but at Rome it met with different treatment. Constantine refused to receive it; the people would not allow the emperor to be named in the mass, nor his portrait to be admitted into a church, and instead of it they hung up a representation of the Sixth Council. And, on the arrival of a newly-appointed commander from Constantinople, an outbreak took place, which was only suppressed by the pope's interposition on the side of authority.[y] Philippicus, after a reign of a year and a half, during which he had given himself up to extravagance and debauchery, was deposed and blinded. A.D. 713.
His successor, Anastasius, was a Catholic; and John, who had been intruded into the patriarchate of Constantinople on the deprivation of Cyrus, now sued for the communion of Rome, professing that he had always been orthodox at heart, and that his compliance with the late heretical government had arisen from a wish to prevent the appointment of a real Monothelite.[z] The pope's answer is not known; but in 715 John was deprived, and Germanus, bishop of Cyzicum, was appointed to the patriarchal chair.[a] Anastasius was in 716 dethroned by Theodosius III., and Theodosius, in the following year, by Leo the Isaurian, whose reign saw the commencement of a new and important controversy.

The readiness with which the formulary of Philippicus was received by the eastern bishops and clergy, may be regarded as

[t] Agatho Diac. ap. Hard. iii. 1836; Walch, ix. 430. See p. 48.

[u] Theophanes, 581. Stories of such prophecies were very common in those times.

[x] An account of these proceedings is given by a deacon named Agatho, who had written the original acts. Hard. iii. 1836, seqq.

[y] Anastas. 153; Fleury, xli. 23; Schlosser, 127.

[z] This letter is in Hardouin, iii. 1837. Pagi defends his "economy," xii. 234.

[a] Baron. 714. 3-4; Pagi, xii. 255-261.

indicating not only their subserviency, but that the Monothelite party at that time possessed considerable strength.[b] The public profession of Monothelite doctrine, however, soon became extinct, its only avowed adherents being the Maronite community in Syria. A monastery, dedicated to a saint of the name of Maron, stood between Apamea and Emesa as early as the sixth century; and in the end of the seventh it was under the government of another Maron, who died in 701.[c] The name of *Maronites*, which originally belonged to the members of this monastery, was gradually extended to all the inhabitants of the district of Lebanon,[d] a population chiefly composed of refugees from the Saracen conquests. Among these the Monothelite opinions were held; and, while the other Christian communities of Syria had each its political attachment—the Jacobites being connected with the Mahometan conquerors, and the Catholics (or Melchites) with the emperor—the Maronites preserved their independence together with their peculiar doctrines, under the successors of Maron, who styled themselves patriarchs of Antioch. Thus the community continued until, in the age of the Crusades (A.D. 1182), they submitted to the Latin patriarch of Antioch, and conformed to the Roman church,[e] which in later times has been indebted to the Maronites for many learned men.[f]

[b] Gieseler, I. ii. 482.

[c] Schröckh, xx. 452-4.

[d] See Walch, ix. 477. Against the identification of Maronites with *Maronites* (as by Walch, ix. 485; Schröckh, xix. 44; xx. 454), see Gieseler, I. ii. 483.

[e] Gibbon, iv. 383.

[f] Of these the Assemanni are the most famous. They and other Maronites attempt to clear their ancestors from the charge of Monothelism. But Pagi (xi. 311-3, 602-4; xii. 77) is said to be the only considerable non-Maronite authority among the Romanists who takes this view. See Walch, ix. 476; Schröckh, xx. 454-6; Döllinger, i. 163.

CHAPTER III.

THE WESTERN CHURCH FROM THE DEATH OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE SECOND.

A.D. 604–715.

I. THE relations of the papacy with the empire during the period between the first and the second Gregories may in some degree be understood from the foregoing chapter.

The Monothelite controversy for a time weakened the influence of Rome, both through the error of Honorius in favouring the heretical party and through the collisions between the papacy and the imperial power. But although Martin suffered severely in person for his proceedings in the Council of Lateran, these proceedings—the assembling of such a synod without the emperor's sanction, and the bold condemnation of his ecclesiastical measures—remained as important steps in the advance of the papal claims; and in no long time the authority of the Roman name was re-established by the sixth general council.[a] At that council the title of *Œcumenical* or *Universal Bishop*, which Gregory had not only denounced in others but rejected for himself, was ascribed to Agatho by his representatives,[b] and the bishops of Rome thenceforth usually assumed it.[c]

Agatho obtained from Constantine Pogonatus an abatement of the sum payable to the emperor on the appointment of a pope;[d] and the same emperor granted to Benedict II. that, in order to guard against a repetition of the inconveniences which had been felt from the necessity of waiting for the imperial confirmation, the pope should be consecrated immediately after his election.[e] Yet the necessity of the confirmation still remained,[f] and disputed elections gave the exarchs of Ravenna ample opportunities of interfering in the establishment of the Roman bishops:[g] if indeed the meaning of the edict for the immediate consecration of the pope

[a] Walch, ix. 292; Gieseler, I. ii. 487.

[b] Hard. iii. 1424-6.

[c] It occurs in the profession of faith to be made by a bishop according to the "Liber Diurnus," about A.D. 682-5. Gieseler, I. ii. 187.

[d] "*Relevata est quantitas*," says Anastasius (141) - an expression which may mean either that the payment was lessened or that it was abolished.

[e] Anastas. 146.

[f] As appears from the Liber Diurnus. Gieseler, I. ii. 487.

[g] Milman, ii. 139.

were not that the exarch's ratification should be sufficient, without the necessity of referring the matter to Constantinople.[h]

The political influence of the popes increased in proportion as the emperors were obliged by the progress of the Saracens to concentrate their strength for the defence of their eastern dominions, and to devolve on the bishops of Rome the care of guarding against the Lombards. The popes now possessed some fortresses of their own, and from time to time they repaired the walls of Rome.[i] The Italians came to regard them more than the sovereigns of Constantinople; and such incidents as the rising of the soldiery against the attempt to carry off Sergius,[k] a similar rising in the pontificate of John VI.,[m] and the refusal of the Romans to recognise the authority of Philippicus,[n] are significant tokens of the power which the bishops of Rome had acquired in their own city.[o]

The desolation of the churches of Palestine by the Saracens, and the withdrawal of the patriarchs from Antioch and Jerusalem to the enjoyment of a titular dignity within the empire, afforded the popes a pretext for a new interference in the affairs of the east. A bishop of Joppa had taken it on himself, perhaps with the imperial sanction, to fill up some vacant sees. In opposition to him, Theodore of Rome commissioned Stephen bishop of Dor (whose name has occurred in the history of the Monothelite controversy)[p] to act as his vicar in the Holy Land. The execution of the commission was resisted by the influence of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; but similar delegations were afterwards given by other popes, although it does not appear with what effect.[q]

The differences between the popes and the court encouraged the archbishops of Ravenna to set up pretensions to independence, which they rested on the eastern principle that the civil importance of their city entitled it to such ecclesiastical dignity.[r] The claim caused considerable difficulty to the popes, but was at length set at rest by Leo II.[s] The schism of Istria, which had arisen out of the controversy on the Three Articles in the middle of the sixth century,[t] was, after many temporary accommodations, finally

[h] Note in Mosheim, ii. 83. But see Pagi, xii. 40.
[i] Schröckh, xix. 513; Gieseler, I. ii. 485-6.
[k] P. 51.
[m] A.D. 701. Anastas. 151.
[n] P. 53.
[o] Gieseler, I. ii. 488.
[p] P. 40.
[q] Hard. iii. 639, 642, 717; Baron. 643. 13; Walch, ix. 214; Gieseler, I. ii. 487-8.
[r] Gieseler, I. ii. 489.
[s] Anastas. 145; Fleury, xl. 32.
[t] See vol. i. p. 181; ii. 12.

healed by Sergius in 698.[w] But in the Lombard kingdom, although Catholicism was established from the reign of Grimoald (A.D. 662-671), the church still remained independent of Rome, and the relations of the Lombards with the papacy were not of any cordial or satisfactory kind.[x]

II. The history of the Spanish Church for a century after its abjuration of Arianism consists chiefly in the records of its synods. These assemblies did not confine themselves to the matters of ecclesiastical regulation, but also took an active concern in political affairs.[y] As the sovereignty was elective, the voice of the bishops was influential in the choice of kings; and the kings were naturally desirous to fortify their throne by the support of the clergy. Hence the bishops acquired very great political importance.[z] By this relation between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers, the Church became nationalized, and the connexion with Rome, in which the Catholic bishops had at first found a means of influence and strength, was gradually weakened during the lapse of time from the period of the reconciliation.[a] Gregory had bestowed the pall on Leander, bishop of Seville, but no record is found of its arrival in Spain;[b] later bishops of Seville do not appear to have applied for it; and the royal authority transferred the primacy of Spain to the capital, Toledo.[c]

The most eminent men of the Spanish Church during this time were Isidore, bishop of Seville (*Hispalensis*), and Ildefonso, bishop of Toledo. Isidore, the brother and successor of Leander, held his see from 595 to 636, and was a voluminous writer. His works are little more than compilations, and are valuable chiefly for the fragments of earlier writings which are preserved in them. But his learning and genius were in his own day admired as extraordinary, and his fame afterwards became such that in the ninth century his name was employed to bespeak credit for the great forgery of the Decretals.[d] Ildefonso, who filled the see of Toledo in the middle of the seventh century, distinguished himself in

[w] Anastas. 150; see Pagi, xii. 169; Gieseler, I. ii. 410.

[x] Gieseler, I. ii. 489-490.

[y] Schröckh, xix. 451, seqq.

[z] Gieseler, I. ii. 494.

[a] Planck, ii. 693, 701; Guizot, ii. 331.

[b] Greg. Ep. ix. 124. Gieseler supposes that Leander may have died before its arrival. I. ii. 495.

[c] Gieseler, I. ii. 495. There is a fable that a bishop of Seville went into Africa, and turned Mahometan; and that thereupon King Chindasuintha transferred the primacy. See Mariana, iv. 218.

[d] Mariana, iv. 209; Dupin, v. 62-6; Schröckh, xix. 62-8. For the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, see below, Book II. c. i.

asserting the perpetual virginity of the Saviour's mother. His exertions are said to have been rewarded by her appearing in splendour over the altar of his cathedral, and presenting him with a magnificent vestment to be worn at the celebration of the Eucharist on her festivals.[e]

In the first years of the eighth century, king Witiza forbade appeals to Rome, authorised the marriage of the clergy, and obtained for his measures the sanction of a synod held at Toledo in 701; and it is said that he threatened such of the clergy as should oppose these measures with death.[f] This prince is described as a prodigy of impiety, tyranny, and vice;[g] but it has been shown that the darkness of his reputation appears more strongly in later writers than in those who lived near his own time;[h] and it has been conjectured that he may have only meant to prevent the recurrence of complaints against the immorality of the clergy by reviving the liberty of marriage, which had always existed during the Arian period of the Spanish Church.[i] But, whatever may have been his motives or the details of his acts, the effects of these were soon brought to an end by the Arab conquest of Spain, which dethroned his son Roderick.[k] The mountaineers of the north alone retained their independence with their Christianity. The Christians who fell under the Mahometan dominion received the same humiliating toleration in Spain as elsewhere; and in their depressed condition they were glad once more to look for countenance to the see of Rome.

A.D. 701-10.

A.D. 710-1.

III. In France the disorders of the time tended to lessen the connexion of the Church with Rome. Differences were necessarily decided on the spot; and there is hardly any trace of intercourse with the papal see between the pontificates of the first and the second Gregories.[m] The same troubles which led to this effect caused a general decay of discipline both among the clergy and in the monasteries.[n] When men of the conquering race began to seek after the emoluments and dignities of the Church—a change which is marked by the substitution of Teutonic for Roman names in lists of bishops from the seventh century[o]—they brought much of

[e] Baron. 657. 53, 56; Mariana, iv. 233-42.
[f] Mariana, iv. 305-6; Baron. 702. 12; Planck, ii. 703. The synod is doubtful. Schröckh, xix. 463.
[g] Mariana, iv. 308; Baron. 701. 11-2.
[h] See a long note in Gieseler, I. ii. 495.
[i] Gieseler, I. ii. 497-8.
[k] Pagi, xii. 229; Gibbon, v. 155-7.
[m] Guizot, ii. 167.
[n] Pagi, xi. 576; Gieseler, I. ii. 497.
[o] Pitra, Vie de S. Léger, 150.

their rudeness with them, and canons against hunting and fighting prelates began to be necessary.[p]

At the same time the wealth and temporal influence by which such persons were attracted into the ranks of the clergy were continually on the increase. Vast gifts of land and of money were bestowed by princes on churches and monasteries, sometimes from pious feeling, sometimes by way of compromise for the indulgence of their vicious passions. Thus Dagobert, the last Mero- A.D. 628-vingian who possessed any energy of character, by the 638. advice of St. Eligius, his master of the mint, enlarged a little chapel of St. Denys, near Paris, into a splendid monastery, furnished it with precious ornaments, the work of the pious goldsmith, and endowed it with large estates, partly the spoil of other religious houses.[q] This prince, "like Solomon," says Fredegar, "had three wives and a multitude of concubines;" and the chronicler seems to consider it as a question whether this liberality were not sufficient to cover his sins.[r] Another writer, however, is able to give more satisfactory information. A hermit on an island in the Mediterranean, it is said, was warned in a vision to pray for the soul of king Dagobert. He then saw the king in chains, hurried along by a troop of fiends, who were about to cast him into a volcano, when his cries to St. Denys, St. Michael, and St. Martin, brought to his assistance three venerable and glorious persons, who drove off the devils, and, with songs of triumph, bore the rescued soul to Abraham's bosom.[s]

On the re-union of the monarchy under Dagobert's father, Clotaire II., the bishops were summoned to an assembly of the *leudes*, and seventy-nine of them appeared at it. The A.D. 614. laws passed by the joint consent of the spiritual and temporal aristocracies show traces of ecclesiastical influence, not only in the increase of clerical privileges, but in the humane spirit which pervades them.[t] From that time bishops appear mixing deeply in political strife. Saints become conspicuous objects of general interest.[u] The severity of their lives acquires influence for them, but this influence is exercised in the rude contentions

[p] Ozanam, 89.

[q] Gesta Dagoberti, ap. Bouquet, t. ii. cc. 9-10; Martin, ii. 197.

[r] "Seems," I must say; for the passage is beyond my power of construing. Fredeg. Chron. c. 60.

[s] Gesta Dagob. ap. Bouquet, ii. 593. Baronius (647. 5) maintains the truth of this story, which is represented on the beautiful monument of Dagobert, erected at St. Denys by St. Louis. Pagi thinks otherwise, but says that Dagobert repented betimes, and lived many years in piety. This, however, seems very questionable.

[t] Michelet, i. 364; Gieseler, I. ii. 417.

[u] Sismondi, ii. 56-8.

of the age. One of the most famous of these saints, Leodegar (or Leger), bishop of Autun, may be mentioned by way of example.[x] Leodegar was sprung from or connected with the most powerful families of the Frankish nobility. He acquired great credit with Bathildis, the saintly Anglo-Saxon who rose from the condition of a captive to be queen and regent of Neustria, and by her he was promoted from the abbacy of St. Maixent to the see of Autun.[y] He is celebrated for the austerity of his life, for his frequency in prayer, for his eloquence as a preacher, for his bounty to the poor and to his church, and for his vigilant administration of his episcopal office.[z] But he appears as the chief of a powerful party of nobles, he takes the lead in setting up and in dethroning kings, and, if he did not actually bear the title (as is sometimes said), he for a time exercised the power of Mayor of the Palace in the Neustro-burgundian kingdom. After various turns of fortune, he fell into the hands of his rival Ebroin, who caused his eyes to be put out—an operation which he bore with perfect calmness, singing psalms during the execution of it.[a] Two years later, by order of Ebroin, he was exposed to tortures, his lips were cut off, his tongue was cut out, and he was dragged over sharp stones with such violence, that for a time he was unable to stand.[b] Notwithstanding the loss of his organs of speech, Leodegar was able to speak as well as ever. His sufferings and his merits raised a general enthusiasm in his favour, and Ebroin resolved on his death. A great council of bishops was summoned, and Leodegar was accused before it of having been concerned in the death of Childeric II. —a prince who had owed his throne to the bishop, but had afterwards imprisoned him in the monastery of Luxeuil, and had been put to death by the party with which Leodegar was connected, and which was much influenced by the counsels which it received from him while himself in confinement.[c] Leodegar denied the charge, and referred to God as a witness of his innocence.[d] But his guilt was considered as certain; his robe was rent, in token of degradation from his order, and he was beheaded.[e] Leodegar was revered as a martyr, and is said to have performed innumerable miracles after death. Yet among his opponents were also some who are ranked in the number of saints—such as

A.D. 670.

A.D. 678.

[x] See the old Life of him in Mabillon, ii. 680, seqq. Also Vie de S. Léger, by Dom Pitra, Paris, 1846; and Milman, ii. 220, seqq.

[y] Martin, ii. 208; Pitra, 109, 244.

[z] Vita, 1-2.

[a] Vita, 10.

[b] Vita, 13; Pitra, 341.

[c] Sismondi, ii. 68-9.

[d] Pitra, 378.

[e] In the account of his death, Pitra follows a very legendary "Passion." Rohrbacher even exceeds his usual absurdity of manner in an attack on Sismondi for some inaccuracies as to this saint. x. 327.

Audoen (Ouen), bishop of Rouen, the friend and biographer of St. Eligius, Præjectus (Prix) of Clermont, and Agilbert of Paris. Ouen's part in the struggle is celebrated for the short and significant answer which he gave when consulted by Ebroin—"Remember Fredegund"—words which may have been meant only to recommend the imitation of that famous queen's readiness and decision, but which we can hardly read without thinking also of the unscrupulous wickedness by which her purposes were accomplished.[f]

IV. The early history of Christianity in the various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms is marked by much similarity of circumstances. Missionaries meet with a friendly reception. The king, after some prudent hesitation, becomes a convert. His successors relapse into heathenism, until, after a time, the throne is filled by a prince who had learnt the truths of the Gospel in exile, and the profession of the faith is restored. Matrimonial alliances exercise the same influence in the spreading of religion, which had before been seen among the barbarian conquerors of Gaul, Spain, and Italy. Among the evidences by which the Gospel was recommended, we find frequent mention of miracles, and not uncommonly the argument from temporal interest—the experience of the fruitlessness of serving the pagan deities, and the inference that they had no power to help or to punish.[g]

In the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons two rival agencies were concerned—that of the Irish or Scottish, and that of the Roman party. Some of the differences as to usage between the Roman missionaries and the British church have already been mentioned.[h] Another subject of contention was the form of the tonsure. The Romans shaved the crown of the head, in imitation of the crown of thorns; the Scots and Irish shaved the front as far as the ears, in the form of a crescent. It was not until monachism became popular that any tonsure was introduced; nor did it become usual among the western clergy until the sixth century.[i] But the Roman practice was now referred to St. Peter, while the other was traced by its opponents to Simon Magus—a derivation which the Scots appear not to have disputed, contenting themselves with insisting on the virtues of some who had used the fashion.[k] The degree in

[f] Sismondi, ii. 72-3; Martin, ii. 212.

[g] For instance, the speech of the Northumbrian priest Coifi (Beda, ii. 13). The argument, however, might be turned against the Gospel also; thus the East Saxons apostatised during a pestilence. Beda, iii. 30.

[h] Page 19.

[i] Thomassin, I. ii. 27. 13-14.

[k] Ceolfrid, Ep. ad Naitan, ap. Bed. v. 21; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 51; Lanigan, iii. 69. Mabillon says that the Scot-

which the Irish were affected by these differences appears from the statement of Laurence, the successor of Augustine, that an Irish bishop named Dagan refused, when in England, to partake of food with the Italian clergy, and even to eat under the same roof with them.[m] Honorius and other bishops of Rome endeavoured to allay these differences by writing to the bishops of the national party.[n] They succeeded in gaining the Irish,[o] and even some of the Britons; but the Scots continued obstinately to hold out.

Paulinus, the first archbishop of York, had, on the death of his convert Edwin, king of Northumbria, withdrawn to the bishoprick of Rochester, while the northern kingdom relapsed into idolatry.[p] Oswald, who in 635 ascended the Northumbrian throne, had been converted while an exile in Scotland, and, in undertaking the conversion of his subjects, naturally looked to the same church through which he had himself received his knowledge of the Gospel.[q] At his request a bishop was sent from Iona, but he was a man of stern character, and, after a short trial, withdrew in anger and despair at the obstinacy of the Northumbrians. The fathers of Iona met in consultation, and he indignantly related to them the failure of his enterprise; when, after he had finished, one of the monks, in a gentle tone of voice, told him that he had proceeded wrongly, and ought rather to have condescended to the rudeness and ignorance of those to whom he had been sent. Immediately the brethren exclaimed that the speaker, Aidan, was right; that the method which he had suggested was the true one, and that he was the fittest person to execute it.[r] He was forthwith consecrated as a bishop, and was recommended to Oswald, who assigned the island of Lindisfarne for his residence. Here Aidan established the system of Iona; the bishops, with their staff of clergy, lived according to monastic rule, in a community governed by an abbot.[s] Oswald zealously assisted his labours in spreading the Gospel; and, as Aidan was but imperfectly acquainted with the language of the country, the king himself, who had learnt the

A.D. 633.

tish tonsure was ascribed to Simon because it was "qualis Simoni Mago aliisque hominibus calvis sponte nascitur." (Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. iii. præf. p. ix.) The authority for the sorcerer's baldness is not cited. A more probable explanation is given by Thomassin (I. ii. 28. 14), that the objectionable tonsure was referred to Simon as having been, according both to Scripture and to legend, the adversary of St. Peter.

[m] Beda, ii. 4.

[n] Ib. ii. 19.

[o] The Roman Easter was received in the south of Ireland about A.D. 633; but the northern Irish held out longer. Beda, iii. 3; Lanigan, ii. 389.

[p] Ib. ii. 20.

[q] Ib. iii. 3.

[r] Ib. iii. 5.

[s] Beda, Vit. S. Cuthb. c. 6; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 154.

Celtic during his exile, often acted as interpreter while the bishop delivered his religious instructions.[t]

Aidan's settlement at Lindisfarne was followed by a large immigration of Scottish missionaries into England. Bede—Roman as he is in his affections, and strongly opposed to their peculiarities—bears hearty witness to the virtues of these northern clergy—their zeal, their gentleness, their humility and simplicity, their earnest study of Scripture, their freedom from all selfishness and avarice, their honest boldness in dealing with the great, their tenderness and charity towards the poor, their strict and self-denying life.[u] "Hence," he says, with an implied allusion to the degeneracy of his own time, "in those days the religious habit was held in great reverence, so that wheresoever any clerk or monk appeared, he was joyfully received by all as the servant of God; even if he were met with on his journey the people ran to him, and, with bended neck, were glad to be either signed with his hand or blessed by his mouth; and they diligently gave ear to his words of exhortation. And if perchance a priest came to any village, forthwith the inhabitants gathered together, and were careful to seek from him the word of life."[x] Of Aidan himself the historian says that he thoroughly endeavoured to practise all that he knew of Christian duty; and that, even as to the paschal question, while he erred in differing from the catholics, he earnestly studied to unite with them in celebrating the great facts of our redemption through the passion, resurrection and ascension of the Saviour.[y] Aidan's successors were of like character. By them Christianity was not only spread over Northumbria, but other kingdoms, as Mercia and Essex, even to the northern bank of the Thames, were evangelized by missionaries who derived their orders immediately or more remotely from St. Columba's foundation at Iona.[z]

But collisions with the Roman party were inevitable. Oswy, the brother and successor of Oswald, who had learnt his Christianity and had been baptised in Scotland, married a Kentish princess, Eanfleda. The royal pair adhered to the customs of their respective teachers; and thus, while Oswy was celebrating the Easter festival, the queen was still engaged in the penitence of Lent.[a] The king's eldest son and colleague, Alfrid, strongly took up the Roman views, and expelled the Scottish monks from a monastery at Ripon

[t] Beda, iii. 3.

[u] iii. 2, 4, 17, 26.

[x] iii. 26. See Wordsworth Eccles. Sonnets, pt. i. 19. Hume refers to the passage as showing the height to which priestly domination was carried among the Anglo-Saxons! i. 55.

[y] iii. 17.

[z] Ib. 21, 22, 24.

[a] Ib. 25.

in order to substitute Romanizers, under Wilfrid, a priest of Northumbrian birth, who, having become discontented with the customs of Lindisfarne, had been sent by Eanfleda's patronage to Rome, and had returned to his native country with a zealous desire to propagate the usages of the Roman Church.[b] The paschal question was discussed in a conference at Streaneshalch (Whitby), in 664. Oswy and his son were present. On the part of the Scots appeared Colman of Lindisfarne, with Cedd, a Northumbrian, who had been consecrated as bishop by Aidan's successor Finan, and had effected a second conversion of Essex;[c] and they were strengthened by the countenance of the royal and saintly abbess Hilda. On the other side stood Agilbert, a native of France, who had studied in Ireland and had held the see of Dorchester in Wessex,[d] and with him was Wilfrid. Agilbert, on the plea of inability to speak the language of the country fluently, put Wilfrid forward as the champion of Rome. He argued from the custom of that Church in which St. Peter and St. Paul had lived and taught, had suffered and had been buried. St. John, to whom the other party traced its practice,[e] had, he said, observed it from a wish to avoid offence to the Jews; but the Churches which that Apostle had governed had, since the Council of Nicæa, conformed to the Roman practice; and neither St. John, nor even the founder of Iona, if alive, would maintain, in opposition to Rome, a practice which was observed only by a handful of insignificant persons in a remote corner of the earth. On Wilfrid's quoting our Lord's promise to bestow on St. Peter "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," Oswy asked Colman whether these words had really been spoken to the Apostle. Colman assented, and owned, in answer to a further question, that he could not produce any such grant of authority to St. Columba. "I tell you then," said the king, "that Peter is the doorkeeper whom I will not gainsay, lest perchance, if I make him my enemy by disregarding his statutes, there should be no one to open the door of heaven to me."[f] The Roman party was

[b] Beda, iii. 25; v. 19; Life of Wilfrid, by Eddi, 2-7, in Gale, Hist. Brit. Veteres, i. Wilfrid was born in 634, Eadmer, ap. Pagi, xi. 515. For his first journey to Rome, see Pagi, xi. 514-5.

[c] Beda, iii. 22.

[d] Ib. 7. He had resigned it in 661. Note in Godwin, De Præsulibus, 279.

[e] It was, however, as we have seen, a mistake to identify the Scotch practice with that of the Quartodecimans. See vol. i. p. 495.

[f] Beda, iii. 25. Archdeacon Churton (p. 78) and Mr. Martineau (p. 80) speak of these words as a jest, and suppose that the council assented to them as such. But there is no ground for this, except the wish of the writers to save the king's character for theological argument, while they leave his decision and that of the assembly without a motive.

victorious. Some of the Scots conformed, while Colman and others withdrew to their own country.[g]

Wilfrid was appointed to the bishoprick thus vacated; but he chose to take his title from York, which Gregory had marked out as the seat of an archbishop,[h] rather than from the Scottish foundation of Lindisfarne. As the bishops of England were all more or less tainted by a connexion with Scottish or Irish orders, Wilfrid was not content to receive his consecration at their hands. He therefore passed into France, where he was consecrated, with great pomp, by Agilbert, now bishop of Paris,[i] with twelve other prelates.[k] The vessel in which he was embarked on his return was stranded on the coast of Sussex. The savage and heathen inhabitants rushed down to plunder it, headed by a priest, who, "like another Balaam,"[m] stood on a rising ground uttering spells and curses. But the priest was killed by a stone from a sling; the crew repelled three attacks, and, as the assailants were preparing for a fourth, the returning tide heaved off the vessel, which then made its way prosperously to Sandwich. During Wilfrid's absence, the Northumbrian king had bestowed the bishoprick on Ceadda (or Chad), who had received consecration in England, and had entered on his see. Wilfrid, therefore, retired to his monastery of Ripon, where he remained for some years, except when invited to perform episcopal functions in a vacant or unprovided diocese.[n]

A great plague in the year 664 carried off the first native archbishop of Canterbury, Frithona, who, on his elevation to the see, had assumed the name of Adeodatus or Deusdedit.[o] The kings of Northumbria and Kent agreed to send a presbyter named Wighard to Rome for consecration. But Wighard died there, and pope Vitalian, apparently in compliance with a request from the kings, chose Theodore, a native of Tarsus, to take his place.[p] Theodore was already sixty-six years of age. He was of eminent repute for learning, but his oriental birth suggested some suspicions, and he was not consecrated until, by allowing his hair to grow for four months, he had qualified himself for receiving the Latin tonsure instead of the Greek.[q] Theodore arrived in England A.D. 668.

[g] Beda, iii. 26-8.

[h] See p. 19.

[i] Agilbert has already been mentioned in this character, p. 61. He obtained the see in the year of the conference at Whitby. Pagi, xi. 540.

[k] Eddi, c. 12; Beda, iii. 28; iv. 19.

[m] Eddi, c. 13.

[n] Eddi, c. 14.

[o] Godwin, 40.

[p] Beda, iii. 29; iv. 1; Milman, ii. 83.

[q] The Greek tonsure, which was referred to St. Paul as its author, consisted in shaving (or rather in closely clipping) the whole head. Thomassin, I. ii. 28, 10-11; Martene, ii. 15.

in 669, and held his see for twenty-one years. Under him the churches of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, which until then had been independent of each other, were for the first time united. He styled himself archbishop of all England; for York had had no archbishop since Paulinus. Theodore was very earnest and active in providing the means of education throughout the church. The resort of English students to the monasteries of Ireland, as seminaries superior to any that could be found in their own country,[r] was now checked by the establishment of schools, in which the learning and the science of the age were taught, and it is said that not only Latin but the Greek primate's native tongue was spoken as fluently as English.[s] The archbishop visited every part of the country. On reaching Northumbria, he inquired into the case of Chad, and disallowed his consecration—partly, it would seem, because it was not derived from a purely Roman source, and partly on account of Wilfrid's prior claims to the see. The bishop meekly replied, "If you judge that I have not received the episcopate rightly, I willingly retire from my office, of which, indeed, I never thought myself worthy, but which, although unworthy, I agreed to undertake for the sake of obedience to command." Theodore was struck with this humility; he reordained him through all the grades; and while Wilfrid took possession of the Northumbrian diocese, Chad, after a short retirement in the monastery of Lastingham, was appointed by the king of Mercia, on the archbishop's recommendation, to the see of Lichfield.[t]

A.D. 669.

Gregory's scheme for the ecclesiastical organisation of England had never taken effect. The bishopricks had originally been of the same extent with the kingdoms, except that in Kent there was a second see at Rochester.[u] Theodore was desirous of increasing the episcopate, and, in a council held at Hertford, in 673, proposed a division of the dioceses; but, probably from fear of opposition, he did not press the matter.[x] Soon after this council, Wilfrid again fell into trouble. Egfrid, the son and successor of Oswy, was offended because the bishop, instead of aiding him to overcome the inclination of his first queen for a life of virginity, had encouraged her in it, and had given her the veil; and the king was further provoked by the suggestions of his second queen, who

[r] Beda, iii. 27; Gieseler, I. ii. 499.
[s] Beda, iv. 2.
[t] Beda, iv. 2-3.
[u] See Lingard, A. S. C. i. 86; Lappenberg, tr. i. 190-2.
[x] Wilkins, i. 43; Inett, i. 96; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 132-3.

invidiously dwelt on Wilfrid's wealth, his influence, and the splendour of his state.[y] Theodore lent himself to the royal schemes, and not only disregarded the rights of Wilfrid, by erecting the sees of Hexham and Sidnacester (near Gainsborough) within his diocese, but superseded him by consecrating a bishop for York, as well as bishops for the new dioceses of Hexham and Lindsey.[z] Wilfrid determined to seek redress from Rome. A storm, which carried him to the coast of Friesland, saved him from the plots which, by Egfrid's influence, had been laid for detaining him in France.[a] After preaching for some time in Frisia, where his labours were rewarded by the conversion of the king, Aldgis, with most of the chiefs and some thousands of the people, he made his way to Rome, where he arrived in 679. His case was investigated by pope Agatho, with a council of fifty bishops, who decided that, if his diocese were divided, the new sees should be filled with persons of his own choosing, and that those who had possession of them should be expelled;[b] and he was invited to take a place in the council against the Monothelites,[c] where he signed the acts as representative of the whole church of Britain.[d]

A.D. 677-8.

Oct. 679. (Jaffé.)

The Roman Council had denounced heavy penalties against all who should contravene its decisions; kings, in particular, were threatened with excommunication. But Egfrid, instead of submitting, imprisoned Wilfrid, and only offered to release him and to restore him to a part of his old diocese, on condition of his renouncing the papal statutes. The imprisonment lasted nine months, at the end of which Wilfrid was set at liberty through the influence of the queen, who had been smitten with dangerous illness for possessing herself of his reliquary.[e] He now sought a field of labour at a distance from his persecutors—the kingdom of Sussex, the scene of the perilous adventure on his return from France many years before. The only Christian teachers in Sussex had been six poor Irish monks, who had a little monastery at Bosham, but made no progress in converting the inhabitants. The king, Ethelwalch, had lately been baptised in Mercia, and gladly patronised the new preacher of the Gospel. The people of Sussex were indebted to Wilfrid for the knowledge of useful arts, such as fishing, as well

[y] Beda, iv. 19; Eddi, c. 23; Inett, i. 89.

[z] Beda, iv. 12 and notes; Eddi, c. 23; see Johnson, i. 118.

[a] Eddi, 25-6.

[b] Wilkins, i. 44-7; Eddi, 29-31.

[c] See p. 46.

[d] Hard. iii. 1131. See Pagi, xi. 628; Collier, i. 248; Inett, i. 99.

[e] Eddi, 33-8.

as of Christianity. He established a bishoprick at Selsey, and extended his labours to the isle of Wight and into the kingdom of Wessex.[f]

A.D. 690. Theodore, at the age of eighty-eight, feeling the approach of death, began to repent of the part which he had taken against Wilfrid. He sent for him, begged his forgiveness, reconciled him with Aldfrid,[g] the new king of Northumbria, and urged him to accept the succession to the primacy. Wilfrid professed a wish to leave the question of the primacy to a council; but he recovered the sees of York and Hexham, with the monastery of Ripon.[h] Theodore died in the same year, and was succeeded by Beretwald; and after a time Wilfrid was again ejected for refusing to consent to certain statutes of the late archbishop. He withdrew into Mercia, whence he was summoned in 702 to appear before a synod at Onestrefield, in Yorkshire, which required him to renounce his episcopal office, and to content himself with the monastery of Ripon. The old man indignantly declared that he would not abandon a dignity to which he had been appointed forty years before. He recounted his merits towards the Church, saying nothing of his zealous labours for the spreading of the Gospel, his encouragement of letters, or the stately churches which he had erected, but insisting on his opposition to the Scottish usages, on his introduction of the Latin chant, and of the Benedictine rule; and again he repaired to Rome, while his partisans in England were put under a sort of excommunication.[i] The pope, John VI., was naturally inclined to favour one whose troubles had arisen from a refusal to obey the decrees of Theodore except in so far as they were consistent with those of the Apostolic see. And when, at Easter 704, the acts of the Roman synod against the Monothelites were publicly read, the occurrence of Wilfrid's name among the signatures, with the coincidence of his being then again at Rome, as a suitor for aid against oppression, raised a general enthusiasm in his favour.[k] He would have wished to end his days at Rome, but by the pope's desire he returned to England. Beretwald received him kindly; but Aldfrid set at nought the pope's letter in favour of Wilfrid, until on his deathbed he relented, and, after his death, the testimony of

[f] Beda, iv. 13, 16; v. 19; Eddi, 40-1.

[g] A different person from Alfrid previously mentioned. Mabillon, v. 702.

[h] Eddi, 41-2.

[i] Eddi, 43-7; Milman, ii. 88. "This," says Fuller, "may be observed in this Wilfrid; his *παέργα* were better than his *ἔργα*, his casual and occasional were better than his intentional performances; which shows plainly that Providence acted more vigorously in him than his own prudence." i. 133.

[k] Eddi, 51; Beda, v. 19.

his sister as to his last wishes procured for the bishop a restoration to the see of Hexham, although it does not appear that he ever recovered the rest of his original diocese. In 709 Wilfrid closed his active and troubled life at the monastery of Oundle.[m]

The Roman customs as to Easter and the tonsure gradually made their way throughout the British isles. In 710 they were adopted by the southern Picts, in consequence of a letter addressed to king Naitan by Ceolfrid, abbot of Jarrow.[n] Adamnan, abbot of Iona, who had been converted in Northumbria, in vain attempted to introduce them into his monastery;[o] but Egbert, an English monk who had received his education in Ireland,[p] was more fortunate, and, having lived to see the Catholic Easter celebrated for the first time by the monks of St. Columba in 729, he expired on the same day.[q] The ancient British Church held out until the end of the eighth century, but appears to have then conformed to the Roman computation of Easter, and, if disputes afterwards arose on the subject, they soon died away.[r]

Christianity had had a powerful effect on the civilisation of the Anglo-Saxons,[s] and by the exertions of Theodore, Wilfrid, and others, arts and learning were now actively cultivated in England. Benedict Biscop, the founder of the abbey of Wearmouth, who was the companion of Wilfrid in his first visit to Rome, brought back with him the arch-chanter John, by whom the northern clergy were instructed in the Gregorian chant, the course of the festivals, and other ritual matters.[t] From six expeditions to Rome Benedict brought home large supplies of books, relics, vestments, vessels for the altar, and religious pictures.[u] Instead of the thatched wooden churches with which the Scottish missionaries had been content,[x] Benedict and Wilfrid, with the help of masons from France, erected buildings of squared and polished stone, with glazed windows and leaded roofs.[y] Wilfrid built a large structure of this kind over the little wooden church at York, in which Paulinus had baptised the Northumbrian king Edwin, but which had since fallen into disrepair and squalid neglect.[z] At Ripon he raised another church, which was consecrated with great pomp and ceremony; two kings were present, and the festivities lasted three days and

[m] Eddi, 54-61; Beda, iv. 20; Pagi, xii. 201; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 144.
[n] Beda, v. 21.
[o] Ib. iv. 15.
[p] Ib. iii. 4.
[q] Ib. iv. 22.
[r] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 63.
[s] Milman, ii. 72.
[t] Beda, Hist. Eccl. iv. 18; Vitæ Abbatum, 6.
[u] Beda, VV. Abb. 3; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 207.
[x] Beda, iii. 25.
[y] Beda, VV. Abbat. 5; Hussey, n. in Bed. p. 319.
[z] Eddi, 16.

nights.[a] His cathedral at Hexham was still more remarkable, and is described as the most splendid ecclesiastical building north of the Alps.[b] Benedict Biscop's churches were adorned with pictures brought from Italy. Among them are mentioned one of the Blessed Virgin, a set of scenes from the Apocalypse, representing the last judgment, and a series in which subjects from the Old Testament were paralleled with their antitypes from the New; thus, Isaac carrying the wood for his sacrifice corresponded to our Lord bearing the Cross, and the Brazen Serpent to the Crucifixion.[c]

During the long primacy of Theodore much was done for the organisation of the church. To him has been ascribed the division of the country into parishes; and, although this idea is now generally abandoned, it seems to be admitted that he may have paved the way for the parochial division by introducing the right of patronage, which had been established in his native church by Justinian.[d]

Monasteries had now been founded and endowed in great numbers. In some of them recluses of both sexes lived, although in separate parts of the buildings.[e] Many ladies of royal birth became abbesses or nuns; and at length it was not unusual for English kings to abdicate their thrones, to go in pilgrimage to Rome, and there to end their days in the monastic habit.[f] But among the Anglo-Saxons, as elsewhere, the popularity of monachism was accompanied by decay.[g] Bede, in his Epistle to Egbert, archbishop of York (A.D. 734) draws a picture of corruptions in discipline and morals, both among monks and clergy, which contrasts sadly with his beautiful sketch of the primitive Scottish missionaries. Among other things, he mentions a remarkable abuse arising out of the immunities attached to monastic property. Land among the Anglo-Saxons was distinguished as *folkland* or *bocland*. The folkland was national property, held of the king on condition of performing certain services, granted only for a certain term, and liable to resumption. The bocland was held by *book* or charter, for one or more lives or in perpetuity, and was exempted from most of the duties with which the folkland was burdened; in some cases it was exempt from all duties. The estates of monasteries were

[a] Eddi, 17.

[b] Eddi, 22.

[c] Beda, V.V. Abbat. 9. In the earliest ages it had been very usual, instead of directly representing the great events of the New Testament, to symbolize them by typical parallels from the Old Testament.—Lindsay on Christian Art, i. 47.

[d] See vol. i. p. 504; Collier, i. 262; Inett, i. 154; Lappenberg, tr. i. 196.

[e] Lingard, A.S.C. i. 211, 214.

[f] Beda iv. 19; v. 7; Baron. 709, 5.

[g] See Bede's account of Coldingham, iv. 25; Inett. i. 126-7; Lingard, A.S.C. i. 230.

bocland, and, so long as the monastic society existed, the land belonged to it. In order to secure the advantages of this tenure, some nobles professed a desire to endow monasteries with the lands which they held as folkland. By presents or other means they induced the king and the witan (or national council) to sanction its conversion into bocland; they erected monastic buildings, and in these they lived with their wives and families, styling themselves abbots, but having nothing of the monastic character except the name and the tonsure.[h]

Among the men of letters whom the English church produced in this age the most celebrated is Bede. The fame which he had attained in his own time is attested by the fact that he was invited to Rome by Sergius, although the pope's death prevented the acceptance of the invitation;[i] and from the following century he has been commonly distinguished by the name of Venerable.[k] Born about the year 673,[m] in the neighbourhood of Jarrow, an offshoot from Benedict Biscop's abbey of Wearmouth, he became an inmate of the monastery at the age of seven, and there spent the remainder of his life. He tells us of himself, that, besides the regular exercises of devotion, he made it his pleasure every day "either to learn or to teach or to write something."[n] He laboured assiduously in collecting and transmitting the knowledge of former ages, not only as to ecclesiastical subjects but in general learning. His history of the English Church comes down to the year 731. His death took place on the eve of Ascension day, 734, his last moments having been spent in dictating the conclusion of a version of St. John's Gospel.[o]

Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, who died in 709, was distinguished as a divine and as a poet.[p] And Caedmon, originally a servant of St. Hilda's abbey, at Streaneshalch, displayed poetical gifts which his contemporaries referred to miraculous inspiration.[q] The Anglo-Saxons were the first nation which possessed a vernacular religious poetry; and to the honour of the Anglo-Saxon

[h] Beda, Ep. ad Egbert. c. 7; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 226-7, 407-413; Kemble, i. 292-304; ii. 225-8; Lappenberg, tr. ii. 323; Hallam, Supplem. Notes, 261, and his quotation from Allen.

[i] Will. Malmesb. 57-8. This has been questioned, as by Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 190-2, and note K, but see Mr. Hardy's note in Malmesbury, and Mr. Stevenson's Preface to transl. of Bede, xiv.-xvi., where the writer retracts an opinion which he had before expressed against the story.

[k] Stevenson, Preface xxii.

[m] Pagi, xii. 402.

[n] Hist. v. 24.

[o] Cuthbert, ap. Bonifac. Ep. cxiv.; Stevenson, Pref. to Bede, xvii.-xix.; Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 200, 416.

[p] Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 184-9.

[q] Beda, iv. 24; Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 154-5. For translated specimens of Caedmon see Conybeare's Anglo-Saxon Poetry, and Turner, iii. 314-321.

poets, their themes were not drawn from the legends of saints, but from the narratives of Holy Scripture.[r]

V. During this period much was done for the conversion of the Germanic tribes, partly by missionaries from the Frankish kingdom, but in a greater degree by zealous men who went forth from Britain or from Ireland.

The labours of Gall, the companion of Columban, in Switzerland, have been already mentioned.[s] The conversion of the Bavarians has been commonly referred to the sixth century, so as to accord with the statement that Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, the correspondent of Gregory the Great, was a Bavarian princess, and had received an orthodox Christian training in her own land. But even if this statement be mistaken,[t] it is certain that the Bavarians had the advantage of settling in a country which had previously been Christian (for such it was even before the time of Severin);[u] and the remains of its earlier Christianity were not without effect on them.

In 613 a Frankish council, in consequence of reports which had reached it, sent Eustasius, the successor of Columban at Luxeuil, with a monk named Agil, into Bavaria, where they found that many of the inhabitants were infected with heretical opinions which are (perhaps somewhat incorrectly) described as Photinian.[x]

In the middle of the seventh century, Emmeran, a bishop of Aquitaine, was stirred by reports which reached him as to the heathenism of the Avars in Pannonia, to resign his see, and to set out with the intention of preaching in that country. Accompanied by an interpreter skilled in the Teutonic dialects, he made his way as far as Radaspona (Ratisbon), where he was kindly received by Theodo, duke of Bavaria.[y] Theodo, who was already a Christian, represented to the missionary that the disturbed state of Pannonia rendered his undertaking hopeless. He entreated him to remain in Bavaria, where he assured him that his zeal would find abundant exercise; and, when argument proved ineffectual, he forcibly detained him. Emmeran regarded this as a providential intimation of his duty; and for three years he preached with great diligence to the Bavarians. At the end of that time he set out for Rome, but he was waylaid and murdered,

A.D. 649-652.

[r] Milman, ii. 94-5; Gieseler, I. ii. 501.
[s] Page 29.
[t] See above, p. 13, note [u].
[u] See vol. i. p. 453.
[x] Neander, v. 51-3; Rettberg, ii. 187-9.
[y] Schröckh, xix. 155-8; Rettberg, ii. 171-4.

in revenge, it is said, for a crime committed by another, but which he had allowed the guilty parties to charge on him.[z]

In the end of the century, Rudbert, bishop of Worms, at the invitation of another duke named Theodo, undertook a mission into the same country. He baptised Theodo, and founded the episcopal city of Salzburg on the site of the old Roman Juvavium.[a] To the labours of Rudbert is chiefly due the establishment of Christianity in Bavaria. It would seem, however, that he eventually returned to his original diocese of Worms.[b] A.D. 696.

The Christianity of the Thuringians has, like that of the Bavarians, been referred to the sixth century.[c] The country and its rulers were, however, still heathen, when, in the latter part of the seventh century, an Irish bishop named Kilian appeared in it at the head of a band of missionaries, and met with a friendly reception from the duke, Gozbert, whose residence was at Würzburg. After a time, it is said, Kilian went to Rome, and, having been authorised by pope Conon to preach wheresoever he would, he returned to Würzburg, where Gozbert now consented to be baptised. The bishop required him, as a matter of Christian duty, to separate from his wife, Geilana, who had formerly been married to his brother. Gozbert was willing to make the sacrifice; but Geilana took advantage of his absence on a warlike expedition to murder Kilian, with two companions who had adhered to him. The graves of the martyrs were illustrated by miracles; and the vengeance of heaven pursued the ducal house, which speedily became extinct.[f] A.D. 686.[d] A.D. 689.[e]

The tribes to the north of France were visited by missionaries both

[z] Pagi, xi. 453; the story is full of improbabilities. See Schröckh, xix. 158; Rettberg, ii. 191.

[a] Vita, ap. Mabillon, iii. 339, seqq.; Bouquet, iii. 632; Conversio Bagoariorum, c. i. ap. Pertz, xi.; Pagi, xii. 271; Rettberg, ii. 201.

[b] So Rettberg (ii. 210-1) infers from the words of the 'Conversio Bagoariorum'—"ad propriam remeavit sedem." But the editor in Pertz's collection, Dr. Wattenbach, supposes that Salzburg is meant. There has been much disputing whether Rudbert flourished in the sixth or in the seventh century; but it would seem that the earlier date is chiefly maintained from motives of local partiality. See Pagi, xii. 155-8; Giesele, I. ii. 506, Rettberg, ii. 193-9.

[c] See Schröckh, xvi. 264-5; Rettberg, ii. 297-8.

[d] Pagi, xii. 89.

[e] Pagi, xii. 106.

[f] Baron. 689. 9-14; Schröckh, xix. 144-7; Lanigan, iii. 115-121; Rettberg, ii. 304-5. This story may be traced in its gradual growth. Besides the legendary appearance of the part which relates to Gozbert and his family, the expedition of an *Irish* bishop to Rome is a circumstance which savours of invention later than the time of Boniface. The only points which can be regarded as certain are the mission of Kilian and his murder in the neighbourhood of Würzburg. Rettberg, ii. 306-7.

from that country and from the British isles. Among the most eminent of these was Amandus, a native of Aquitaine, who was consecrated as a regionary (or missionary) bishop about the year 628, and laboured in the country near the Scheld. The inhabitants are described as so ferocious that all the clergy who had attempted to preach to them had withdrawn in despair.[g] Amandus was fortified with a commission from Dagobert, which authorised him to baptise the whole population by force; but he made little progress until, by recovering a man who had been hanged, he obtained the reputation of miraculous power.[h] In consequence of having ventured to reprove Dagobert for the number of his wives and concubines, he was banished; but the king, on marrying a young queen, discarded the others, recalled Amandus, entreated his forgiveness, and on the birth of a prince engaged him to baptise the child. It is said that at the baptism, when no one responded to the bishop's prayer, the mouth of the little Sigebert, who was only forty days old, was opened to utter "Amen."[m] Amandus returned to his old neighbourhood, where, although he had to endure many hardships, and much enmity on the part of the heathen population, and was obliged to support himself by manual work, his preaching was now very effectual. After a time his zeal induced him to go as a missionary to the Slavons on the Danube, but, as he was received by them with an indifference which did not seem to promise either success or martyrdom, he once more resumed his labours in the region of the Scheld, and, on the death of a bishop of Mastricht, he was appointed to that see in the year 647.[n] He found, however, so much both in the disorders of the clergy and in the character of the people to disquiet him, that he expressed to the pope, Martin, a wish to resign the bishoprick. Martin, in a letter[o] which is significant as to the position of the Roman see, endeavoured to dissuade him. He requests Amandus to promulgate the decisions of the Lateran synod, which had just been held,[p] and, with a view to fortifying himself against the empire, he urges the bishop to aid him in strengthening the connexion of king Sigebert with Rome. Notwithstanding the pope's remonstrances Amandus withdrew from his see, after having held it three years, and he spent the re-

A.D. 629.[i]

A.D. 631.[k]

[g] Vita S. Amandi, ap. Bouquet. iii. 533.
[h] Neander, v. 54-6; Rettb. i. 554.
[i] Pagi, xi. 266-7.
[k] Pagi, xi. 337.
[m] Gesta Dagob. ap. Bouquet. ii. 586; Vit. Amand. ib. iii. 534.
[n] Bouquet, iii. 534.
[o] Hard. iii. 945-8.
[p] See p. 44.

mainder of his days in superintending the monasteries which he had founded.[q] At the same time with Amandus, and in a neighbouring region, an Irish missionary named Livin, exerted himself in preaching the Gospel. Livin became bishop of Ghent, and was martyred about the year 650.[r]

Twelve years later than Amandus, Eligius (or Eloy) entered on a course of missionary labour in an adjoining district.[s] Eligius was originally a goldsmith, and, partly by skill in his art, and yet more by his integrity, gained the confidence of Clotaire II. and retained his position under Dagobert.[t] He became master of the mint, and coins of his workmanship are still extant.[u] While yet a layman he was noted for his piety. The Bible always lay open before him as he worked, his wealth was devoted to religious and charitable purposes, he made pilgrimages to holy places, he built monasteries, he bought whole shiploads of captives—Romans, Gauls, Britons, Moors, and especially Saxons from Germany[x]—and endeavoured to train them for Christianity.[y] Such was his charity that strangers were directed to his house by being told that in a certain quarter they would see a crowd of poor persons around the pious goldsmith's door.[z] And already, it is said, his sanctity had been attested by the performance of many miracles.[a] After having spent some time in a lower clerical office, he was consecrated bishop of Noyon in 640, his friend and biographer Audoen (or Ouen) being at the same time consecrated to the see of Rouen.[b] The labours of Eligius extended to the neighbourhood of the Scheld. The inhabitants of his wide diocese were generally rude and ferocious; part of them were heathens, while others were Christians only in name, and the bishop had to encounter many dangers and to endure many insults at their hands.[c] His death took place in the year 659.[d]

[q] Pagi, xi. 412, 428; Rettberg, i. 555.

[r] Vita S. Livini ap. Mabill. ii. 449 (wrongly ascribed to St. Boniface).

[s] The Life of St Eligius, ascribed to St. Ouen, but probably altered or rewritten by a later hand (Rettberg, ii. 508), is published in D'Achery's Spicilegium, vol. ii. folio. I have used the translation by Barthélemy (Paris, 1847), and the extracts from the original quoted by Bouquet, vol. iii.

[t] Vit. i. 5, 9, 14.

[u] Barthélemy gives engravings of some of them.

[x] See Barthélemy, note, p. 338.

[y] Vit. i. 10, 15-18, 21.

[z] Ib. 20.

[a] Ib. 29-31.

[b] Pagi, xi. 345.

[c] Barthélemy, 358.

[d] The sermon of Eligius, 'De Rectitudine Catholicæ Conversationis,' or rather the composition which his biographer gives as containing the essence of many of his sermons (Vit. i. 15-6; Barthél. 142), is celebrated on account of the injustice done to its character as a piece of Christian teaching by Mosheim, Maclaine, Dr. Robertson, and other writers of the last century, whose misrepresentations have been repeatedly exposed, especially by Dr. Maitland, in his viiith Letter on "the Dark Ages." It is printed in the Appendix to St. Augustine's works (vii. 1169-1190), and is said to be in great part derived from the

Among the tribes which shared in the ministrations of Eligius were the Frisians, who then occupied a large tract of country.[e] The successful labours of Wilfrid among them at a later time (A.D. 678), have already been mentioned;[f] but the king whom he converted, Aldgis, was succeeded by a heathen, Radbod.[g] Wulfram, bishop of Sens, at the head of a party of monks, undertook a mission to the Frisians.[h] He found that they were accustomed to offer human sacrifices, the victims being put to death by hanging. In answer to the taunt that, if his story were true, the Saviour of whom he spoke[i] could recall them to life, he restored five men who had been executed, and, after this display of power, his preaching was very successful. Radbod had allowed one of his children to be baptised, and had himself consented to receive baptism; but, when one of his feet was already in the font, he adjured the bishop in God's name to tell him in which of the abodes which he had spoken of the former king and nobles of the nation were. Wulfram replied, that the number of the elect is fixed, and that those who had died without baptism must necessarily be among the damned. "I would rather be there with my ancestors," said the king, "than in heaven with a handful of beggars;" he drew back his foot from the font, and remained a heathen.[k]

But the chief missionary efforts among the Frisians proceeded from the British isles. Egbert, a pious Anglo-Saxon inmate of an Irish monastery (the same who afterwards persuaded the monks of Iona to adopt the Roman Easter),[m] conceived the idea of preaching to the heathens of Germany. He was warned by visions, and afterwards by the stranding of the vessel in which he had embarked, that the enterprise was not for him; but his mind was still intent

sermons of St. Cæsarius of Arles, which were very popular in Gaul. Bähr, ii. 468.

[e] Schröckh, xix. 148-9.

[f] Page 67.

[g] Rettberg, ii. 502, 512.

[h] Life, by Jonas, in Mabill. iii. 357, seqq. The date is uncertain. Pagi gives 689 (xii. 177); Baronius, 700; Döllinger, about 712 (i. 314). Neander thinks that Wulfram was probably later than Willibrord, v. 60.

[i] "Christus tuus." Jonas, 6.

[k] Jonas, 9-11. Neander (v. 60) supposes that Radbod was not sincere in his desire of baptism, and that he spoke "in a half bantering way." But there is no trace of this in the original writer, and his account of the adjurations which the king used is decisive against the supposition. That Radbod (as Jonas relates) died within three days after his rejection of baptism is certainly untrue; and, as *two* versions of the main story are found, which differ considerably from each other, but agree in showing that one who is reprobate would, even at the last moment, be excluded from baptism and salvation, Rettberg thinks that the whole is an invention devised in behalf of the rigid predestinarian doctrine (ii. 515-6). In this he is followed by Ozanam, 167.

[m] Page 69.

on it, and he resolved to attempt it by means of his disciples.[n] One of these, Wigbert, went into Frisia in 690, and for two years preached with much success. On his return, Willibrord,[o] a Northumbrian, who before proceeding into Ireland had been trained in Wilfrid's monastery at Ripon, set out at the head of twelve monks, a further opening for their labours having been made by the victory which Pipin of Heristal, the virtual sovereign of Austrasia, had gained over Radbod at Dorstadt. Pipin received the missionaries with kindness, gave them leave to preach in that part of the Frisian territory which had been added to the Frankish kingdom, and promised to support them by his authority. After a time, Willibrord repaired to Rome with a view of obtaining the papal sanction and instructions for his work, as also a supply of relics to be placed in the churches which he should build.[p] On his return, he preached with such effect, that Pipin wished to have him consecrated as archbishop of the district in which he had laboured, and for this purpose sent him a second time to Rome. The pope, Sergius, consented, and, instead of Willibrord's barbaric name, bestowed on him that of Clement. The archbishop's see was fixed at Wiltaburg,[q] and he appears to have succeeded in extirpating paganism from the Frankish portion of Frisia.[r] He also attempted to spread the gospel in the independent part of the country, and went even as far as Denmark, where, however, his labours had but little effect. In his return he landed on Heligoland, then called Fositesland from a god named Fosite. The island was regarded as holy; no one might touch the animals which lived on it, nor drink, except in silence, of its sacred well. Willibrord baptised three converts in the well, and his companions killed some of the consecrated cattle. The pagan inhabitants, after having waited in vain expectation that the vengeance of the gods would strike the profane strangers with death or madness, carried them before Radbod, who was then in the island. Lots were cast thrice before any one of the party could be chosen for death. At length one was sacrificed, and

A.D. 692.

A.D. 696.

[n] Beda, v. 9.

[o] Life by Alcuin, in Mabillon, iii. 605, seqq.; Beda, v. 10.

[p] Beda, v. 11.

[q] Beda, v. 11. Utrecht then belonged to Radbod, while Wiltaburg, on the opposite side of the Rhine, was Frankish (Gieseler, II. i. 24). It would seem, therefore, that Bede, who states that Pipin gave the archbishop Wiltaburg, and Alcuin, who says that Charles Martel gave him Utrecht (which had in the interval come into possession of the Franks), may both be right, and that Dr. Lingard (A. S. C. ii. 333), who sets Bede aside in favour of Alcuin, is mistaken in identifying the towns.

[r] Schröckh, xix. 152.

Willibrord with the rest was allowed to depart.[s] The renewal of war between Radbod and the Franks interfered for a time with the work of the missionaries. After the death of the pagan king, in 719, circumstances were more favourable for the preaching of the gospel in the independent part of Frisia, and Willibrord continued in a course of active and successful exertion until his death in 739.[t] Among his fellow-labourers during a part of this time was Boniface, afterwards the apostle of Germany.

[s] Alcuin, c. 10.

[t] Rettberg, ii. 520-1.

CHAPTER IV.

ICONOCLASM.

A.D. 717-775.

THE gradual advance of a reverence for images and pictures,[a] from the time when art began to be taken into the service of the Church, has been related in the preceding volume.[b] But when it had reached a certain point, art had little to do with it. It was not by the power of form or of colour that the religious images influenced the mind; it was not for the expression of ideal purity or majesty that one was valued above another, but for superior sanctity or for miraculous virtue.[c] Some were supposed to have fallen down from heaven; some, to have been the work of the evangelist St. Luke; and to others a variety of legends were attached. Abgarus, king of Edessa, it was said, when in correspondence with our Lord,[d] commissioned a painter to take the Saviour's likeness. But the artist, dazzled by the glory of the countenance, gave up the attempt; whereupon the Saviour himself impressed his image on a piece of linen and sent it to the king. This tale was unknown to Eusebius, although he inserted the pretended correspondence with Abgarus in his history;[e] and the image was said to have remained in a wall at Edessa until, after a concealment of five centuries, it was discovered by means of a vision. By it, and by a picture of the Blessed Virgin, "not made with hands," the city was saved from an attack of the Persians.[f] Cloths of a like miraculous origin (as was supposed) were preserved in other places;[g] and many images were believed to perform cures and other miracles, to exude sweat or odoriferous balsam, to bleed, to weep, or to speak.

When images had become objects of popular veneration, the cautions and distinctions which divines laid down for the regulation of it were found unavailing. Three hundred years before the time which we have now reached, Augustine, while repelling the charge

[a] In the account of the controversies as to "images," the word will be used to express paintings as well as works of sculpture.

[b] Pp. 326, 513.

[c] Milman, ii. 147-150.

[d] See vol. i. p. 2.

[e] I. 13.

[f] Evagrius, v. 27.

[g] Gibbon, iv. 465-7; Neander, v. 278.

of idolatry from the Church, had felt himself obliged to acknowledge that many of its members were nevertheless "adorers of pictures;"[h] and the superstition had grown since Augustine's day. It became usual to fall down before images, to pray to them, to kiss them, to burn lights and incense in their honour, to adorn them with gems and precious metals, to lay the hand on them in swearing, and even to employ them as sponsors at baptism.[i]

The moderate views of Gregory the Great as to the use and the abuse of images have been mentioned in an earlier chapter.[k] But although, of the two kindred superstitions, the reverence for relics was more characteristic of the western, and that for images of the eastern Church,[m] the feeling of the West in behalf of images was now increased, and the successors of Gregory were ready to take a decided part in the great ecclesiastical and political movements which arose out of the question.

Leo the Isaurian, who had risen from the class of substantial peasantry through the military service of Justinian, until in 717[n] he was raised by general acclamation to the empire, was a man of great energy, and, as even his enemies the ecclesiastical writers do not deny, was possessed of many noble qualities and of talents which were exerted with remarkable success both in war and in civil administration.[o] In the beginning of his reign he was threatened by the Arabs, whose forces besieged Constantinople both by land and by sea; but he destroyed their fleet by the new invention of the "Greek fire,"[p] compelled the army to retire with numbers much diminished by privation and slaughter, and by a succession of victories delivered his subjects from the fear of the Arabs for many years.[q]

It was not until after he had secured the empire against foreign enemies that Leo began to concern himself with the affairs of religion. In the sixth year of his reign,[r] he issued an edict ordering that Jews and Montanists should be forcibly baptised. The Jews submitted in hypocrisy, and mocked at the rites which they had undergone.[s] The Montanists, with the old fanaticism of the sect whose name they bore,[t] appointed a day on which, by general

[h] See vol. i. p. 327.

[i] Basnage, 1335; Schröckh, xx. 515-6; Neander, v. 278; Schlosser, 410.

[k] Page 25. To the same purpose is part of another letter, which, however, labours under suspicion—ad Secundinum, l. ix. 52.

[m] Neander, v. 278.

[n] Theophanes, 600-6; Pagi, xii. 263; Finlay, ii. 17, 29.

[o] Gibbon, iv. 410-1; Schlosser, 140-2; Finlay, vol. ii. c. 1.

[p] As to this, see Gibbon, iv. 182-4.

[q] Theophan. 607-613; Finlay, ii. 17-22.

[r] Schlosser, 161. I have generally followed this writer as to the order and the dates of the proceedings under Leo.

[s] See Schröckh, xix. 316.

[t] Whether they were the same sect with the Montanists of earlier history,

concert, they shut themselves up in their meeting-houses, set fire to the buildings, and perished in the flames.

From these measures it is evident that Leo seriously misconceived the position of the temporal power in matters of religion, as well as the means which might rightly be used for the advancement of religious truth. In the following year, after a consultation with his officers, he made his first attempt against the superstitious use of images.[u] The motives of this proceeding are matter of conjecture.[x] It is said that he was influenced by Constantine, bishop of Nacolia, and by a counsellor named Bezer, who had for a time been in the service of the caliph, and is described as an apostate from the faith.[y] Perhaps these persons may have represented to him the difficulties which this superstition opposed to the conversion of Jews and Mahometans, who regarded it as heathen and idolatrous.[z] They may, too, have set before him the risk of persecution which it must necessarily bring on the Christian subjects of the caliphs.[a] He had seen that towns which relied on their miraculous images had fallen a prey to the arms of the Saracens, and that even the tutelar image of Edessa had been carried off by these enemies of the cross.[b] And when, by whatsoever means, a question on the subject had been suggested, the inconsistency of the popular usages with the letter of Holy Scripture was likely to strike forcibly a direct and unlettered mind like that of the emperor.[c] But in truth it would seem—and more especially if we compare Leo's measures against images with those against Judaism and Montanism—that his object was as much to establish an ecclesiastical autocracy as to purify the practice of the Church.[d] A.D. 724.

The earlier controversies had shown that the multitude could be violently excited about subtle questions of doctrine which might have been supposed unlikely to excite their interest. But here the matter in dispute was of a more palpable kind. The question did

is a question. Dean Milman supposes them to have been probably Manichæans, ii. 154. Baronius also thinks that they may have been Manichæans, and supposes that they were called Montanists (Μοντανούς, Theophan. 617), from having been driven to take refuge among the mountains (722. 1). But see Pagi's note to the contrary. The sect may have been identical with the early Montanists, although its doctrines may have undergone much change in the course of five centuries and a half. Peter of Sicily mentions them as distinct from Manichæans, p. 42, ed. Rader.

[u] Schlosser, 166.

[x] See Walch, x. 204; Gfrörer, ii. 102.

[y] Theophan. 617-8.

[z] Walch, x. 216-8; Schlosser, 161.

[a] Spanheim, Historia Imaginum Restituta (Miscellanea Sacræ Antiquitatis, vol. i. Lugd. Bat. 1703), p. 729.

[b] Gibbon, iv. 467.

[c] Gieseler, II. i. 2.

[d] Finlay, ii. 10, 67.

not originate with a speculative theologian, but with an emperor acting on his own will without being urged by any party or by any popular cry. An attack was made on material and external objects of reverence, on practices which were bound up with their daily familiar religion, and by means of which the sincere although unenlightened piety of the age was accustomed to find its expression. It merely proposed to abolish, without providing any substitute, without directing the mind to any better and more spiritual worship; and at once the multitude, who had already been discontented by some measures of taxation, rose in vehement and alarming agitation against it. The controversy which had occupied the Church for a century was now forgotten; Monothelites were absorbed among the orthodox when both parties were thrown together by an assault on the objects of their common veneration.[e]

Leo would seem not to have anticipated such an excitement. He attempted to allay it by an explanation of the edict which had been issued. It was not, he said, his intention to do away with images, but to guard against the abuse of them, and to protect them from profanation, by removing them to such a height that they could not be touched or kissed.[f] But the general discontent was not to be so easily pacified, and events soon occurred which added to its intensity. A Saracen army, which had advanced as far as Nicæa, was believed to be beaten off by the tutelary images of the city.[g] A volcanic island was thrown up in the Ægean, and the air was darkened with ashes—prodigies which, while the emperor saw in them a declaration of heaven against the idolatry of his subjects, the monks, who had possession of the popular mind, interpreted as omens of wrath against his impious proceedings.[h] The monkish influence was especially strong among the islanders of the Archipelago. These rose in behalf of images; they set up one Cosmas as a pretender to the throne, and an armed multitude, in an ill-equipped fleet, appeared before Constantinople. But the Greek fire discomfited the disorderly assailants; their leaders were taken and put to death;[i] and Leo, provoked by the resistance which his edict had met with, issued a second and more stringent decree, ordering that all images should be destroyed, and that the

A.D. 726.

[e] Baron. 722. 3; Walch, x. 73; Schröckh, xx. 513; Neander, v. 273, 306; Döllinger, i. 348; Gieseler, II. i. 5-6; Milman, ii. 145-6.

[f] Goldast, Imperialia Decreta de cultu Imaginum, Francof. 1608, p. 16. Baron. 726. 1-5; Schlosser, 167. Walch questions this, x. 225 6.

[g] Theoph. 624.

[h] Milman, ii. 156.

[i] Theophanes, 624; Schlosser, 170-1. Mr. Finlay thinks that this insurrection was provoked by heavy taxation, and that the question of images was added to the grievance. ii. 43.

place of such as were painted on the walls of churches should be covered with whitewash.[k]

The emperor, relying on the pliability which had been shown on some former occasions by Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople,[m] had made repeated attempts to draw him into the measures against images.[n] But Germanus, who was now ninety-five years of age, was not to be shaken. He reminded Leo of the oath which he had taken at his coronation, to make no innovations in religion. It is said that in a private interview he professed a conviction that images were to be abolished, "but," he added, "not in your reign." "In whose reign, then?" asked Leo. "In that of an emperor named Conon, who will be the forerunner of Antichrist." "Conon," said the emperor, "is my own baptismal name."[o] Germanus argued that images were meant to represent, not the Trinity, but the Incarnation; that, since the Saviour's appearance in human form, the Old Testament prohibitions were no longer applicable; that the Church had not condemned the use of images in any general council; and he referred to the Edessan impression of our Lord's countenance, and to the pictures painted by St. Luke. "If I am a Jonas," he said, "throw me into the sea. Without a general council, I can make no innovation on the faith." He refused to subscribe the new edict, and resigned his see, to which his secretary Anastasius was appointed.[p] Jan. 730.

A serious disturbance soon after took place on the removal of a noted statue of the Saviour, which stood over the "Brazen Gate" of the imperial palace, and was known by the name of *the Surety*.[q] This figure was the subject of many marvellous legends, and was held in great veneration by the people. When, therefore, a soldier was commissioned to take it down, crowds of women rushed to the place, and eagerly entreated him to spare it. He mounted a ladder, however, and struck his axe into the face; whereupon the women dragged down the ladder, the soldier was either killed by the fall or by their hands, and his body was torn in pieces.[r] They were now excited to frenzy, and, having been joined by a mob of the other sex, rushed to the new patriarch's house with the intention of murdering him. Anastasius took refuge in A.D. 730.

[k] Gibbon, iv. 468. See Walch, x. 225-6.

[m] Gieseler, II. i. 3.

[n] See the letters of Germanus, Hard. iv. 240-261.

[o] Theophan. 626-7. Against this story see Basnage, ii. 1345. For the legend of the promise to Conon that he should be emperor, Finlay, ii. 29-32.

[p] Theophan. 626-9; Baron. 726. 6; Pagi, xii. 387-8; Walch, x. 172, 182, 240; Schlosser, 175-6.

[q] Ἀντιφωνητής.

[r] Gregor. II. ap. Hard. iv. 11.

the palace, and the emperor sent out his guards, who suppressed the commotion, but not without considerable bloodshed.[s] "The Surety" was taken down, and its place was filled with an inscription in which the emperor gave vent to his enmity against images.[t]

This incident was followed by some proceedings against the popular party. Many were scourged, mutilated, or banished;[u] and the persecution fell most heavily on the monks, who were especially obnoxious to the emperor, both as leaders in the resistance to his measures, and because the images were for the most part of their manufacture. Leo is charged with having rid himself of his controversial opponents by shutting up schools for general education which had existed since the time of the first Christian emperor,[x] and even by burning a splendid library with the whole college of professors who were attached to it.[y]

But beyond the emperor's dominions the cause of images found a formidable champion in John of Damascus, the most celebrated theologian of his time.[z] John, according to his legendary biographer, a patriarch of Jerusalem who lived two centuries later, was a civil officer, high in the service of the caliph of Damascus, when his writings against the emperor's measures provoked Leo to attempt his destruction.[a] A letter was counterfeited in imitation of John's handwriting, containing an offer to betray Damascus to the Greeks, and this (which was represented as one of many such letters) Leo enclosed to the caliph, with expressions of abhorrence against the treachery. The caliph, without listening to John's disavowals of the charge, or to his entreaties for a delay of judgment, ordered his right hand to be cut off, and it was exposed in the market-place until evening, when John requested that it might be given to him, in order that by burying it he might relieve the intolerable pain

[s] Theophan. 622-3. See the various accounts in Walch, x. 178-180. The women who perished on this occasion were afterwards canonised. Schlosser, 178-9.

[t] Neander, v. 294.

[u] Theophan. 623.

[x] Theophan. 623.

[y] Spanheim, who defends the iconoclasts against all accusations, says that this is a fiction of the 11th century. Basnage says that the library was really destroyed by an accidental fire, which he places under Basiliscus (ii. 1346), and Mr. Finlay under Leo (ii. 52). Walch regards the story as fabulous, but thinks that the schools may have been suspended for a time by Leo (x. 184, 231-4). Schlosser, however, upholds it. 163-4

[z] Baron. 727, 18-20. John was author of the earliest work of systematic theology, 'An Exposition of the Orthodox Faith.' (Ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως.) This was long the standard authority in the Greek church. In the west, it became known from the 12th century by a Latin translation, and John is considered as the ancestor of the schoolmen. Schröckh, xx. 333-7; Hagenbach, i. 390-1; Gfrörer, ii. 107; Gieseler, vi. 438.

[a] Vita Joh. Damascen. 15-20, in his works ed. Le Quien, Paris, 1712, t. i. pp. x.-xiii. Against this tale, see Basnage, ii. 1279; Spanheim, i. 740.

which he suffered while it hung in the air. On receiving the hand, he applied it to his arm, prostrated himself before an image of the Virgin Mother, prayed that, as he had lost his hand for the defence of images, she would restore it, and vowed thenceforth to devote it to her service. He then lay down to sleep; the "Theotokos" appeared to him in a vision, and in the morning the cure was complete. The caliph, convinced of John's innocence by the miracle, requested him to remain in his service; but John betook himself to the monastery of St. Sabbas, near Jerusalem, where the monks, alarmed at the neophyte's great reputation, were perplexed how to treat him, and subjected him to a variety of degrading and even disgusting trials. But his spirit of obedience endured all; he was admitted into the monastery, and was raised to the rank of presbyter.

Of the three "orations" in which John of Damascus asserted the cause of images, two were written before, and the third after, the forced resignation of Germanus.[b] He argues that images were forbidden to the Jews lest they should fall into the error of their heathen neighbours, or should attempt to represent the invisible Godhead; but that, since the Incarnation, these reasons no longer exist, and we must not be in bondage to the mere letter of Scripture.[c] True it is that Scripture does not prescribe the veneration of images; but neither can we read there of the *Trinity*, or of the *coessentiality*, as distinctly set forth; and images stand on the same ground as these doctrines, which have been gathered by the fathers from the scriptures. Holy Scripture countenances images by the directions for the making of the Cherubim, and by our Lord's words as to the tribute-money. That which bears Cæsar's image is Cæsar's, and is to be rendered to him; so too that which bears Christ's image is to be rendered to Christ, for it is Christ's.[d] That images are material, is no good reason for refusing to reverence them; for the holy places are material, the ink and the parchment of the Gospels are material, the eucharistic table, its vessels and its ornaments,—nay, the very body and blood of the Saviour,—are material.[e] "I do not," says John, "adore the matter, but the Author of matter, who for my sake became material, that by matter He might work out my salvation."[f] Images, he continues, are for the unlearned what books are to those who can read; they are to the sight what speech is to the ears.[g] He

[b] Walch, x. 176.
[c] Orat. i. 7, 8, 16; ii. 7, 8.
[d] Orat. i. 20; ii. 20, 21; iii. 11.
[e] Orat. ii. 14; cf. i. 15.
[f] Orat. i. 16.
[g] Orat. i. 17.

distinguishes between that sort of adoration which is to be reserved for God alone (λατρεία, *service*), and that which for His sake is given to His angels and saints or to consecrated things.[h] He rejects the idea that, if the images of the Saviour and of the Blessed Virgin are to be allowed, those of the saints should be abolished; if the festivals of the saints are kept, if churches are dedicated in their honour, so too ought their images to be reverenced.[i] He adduces a host of authorities from the fathers, with much the same felicity as his quotations from Scripture;[k] the story of Epiphanius and the painted curtain,[m] which had been alleged by the iconoclasts, is set aside on the ground that the letter which contains it might be a forgery, or that Epiphanius might have intended to guard against some unrecorded local abuse; that his own church still used images, and that, in any case, the act of an individual does not bind the whole church.[n] He denies that the emperor has any authority to legislate in ecclesiastical affairs:—"the well-being of the state," he says, "pertains to princes, but the ordering of the Church to pastors and teachers;" and he threatens Leo with Scriptural examples of judgment againt those who invaded the rights of the Church.[o]

In Italy, the measures of Leo produced a great agitation. The allegiance of that country had long been gradually weakening. The exarchs were known to the people only as taxgatherers who drained them of their money and sent it off to Constantinople; for defence against the Lombards or other enemies, the Italian subjects of the empire were obliged to rely on themselves, without any expectation of effective help from the emperor or his lieutenant.[p] The pope was the virtual head of the Italians; and the connexion which the first Gregory and his successors had laboured to establish with the Frankish princes, as a means of strengthening themselves against the empire, had lately been rendered more intimate by the agency of St. Boniface.[q] But the ancient and still undiminished hatred with which the Romans regarded their neighbours the Lombards, acted as a counterpoise to the motives which might have disposed the popes to take an opportunity of breaking with the empire, and Gregory II., although he violently

[h] Orat. i. 14; iii. 16-39.
[i] Orat. i. 19, 21; ii. 11, 15.
[k] Orat. i. 27 seqq.; ii. 23; iii. 39. See Dupin, vi. 102; Schröckh, xx. 547-8.
[m] See vol. i. p. 326.
[n] Orat. i. 26. In ii. 18, he says absolutely that the letter is forged.
[o] Orat. ii. 12.
[p] Schröckh, xix. 518; Milman, ii. 204.
[q] Schröckh, xix. 519-20. See the next chapter.

opposed Leo on the question of images, yet acted in some sort the part of a mediator between him and his Italian subjects.[r]

Gregory, on receiving the edicts against images, rejected them. The people of Ravenna expelled the exarch, who sought a refuge at Pavia. Liutprand, king of the Lombards, eagerly took advantage of the disturbances to pour his troops into the imperial territory, and, sometimes in hostility to the exarch, sometimes in combination with him against the pope, endeavoured to profit by the dissensions of his neighbours. The exarch was killed in the course of the commotions. The pope, hoping for the conversion of Leo (as it is said by writers in the Roman interest,[s]) restrained the Italians from setting up a rival emperor; and, when Liutprand, in alliance with a new exarch, appeared before the walls of Rome, he went out to him, and prevailed on the Lombard king to give up his design against the city. Thus far, therefore, it would appear that the emperor was chiefly indebted to Gregory for the preservation of his Italian dominions.[t] But the relations of the pope with the emperor were of no friendly kind. It is said that repeated attempts were made by Leo's order to assassinate Gregory; perhaps the foundation of the story may have been that, as the pope himself states, there was an intention of carrying him off to the east, like his predecessor Martin.[u] On the resignation of Germanus, Gregory refused to acknowledge his successor,[x] and wrote to Leo in a style of vehement defiance.[y] He urges the usual arguments in behalf of images, and reproaches the emperor with his breach of the most solemn engagements. "We must," he says, "write to you grossly and rudely, forasmuch as you are illiterate and gross. . . . Go into our elementary schools, and say, 'I am the overthrower and the persecutor of images;' and forthwith the children will cast their tablets at you, and you will be taught by the unwise that which you refuse to learn from the wise." Leo, he says, had boasted of being like *Uzziah*;[z] that, as the Jewish king destroyed the brazen serpent after it had existed

A.D. 726-730.

[r] Schlosser, 172-4.

[s] Anastas. 156.

[t] Ib. 157. The history of these movements is very intricate, and is full of matter for dispute. Dean Milman's account (ii. 204-7) is the clearest. See also Baron. 726. 25, seqq.; Walch, x. 248-255, 280; Schröckh, xix. 52, seqq.; Schlosser, 167-9; Gieseler, II. i. 32-3.

[u] Greg. ap. Hard. iv. 11; Anastas. 156-7; Walch, x. 283-5; Schröckh, xix. 521; xx. 548

[x] Schlosser, 177.

[y] His two letters (Hard. iv. 1-18) were first published by Baronius (xii. 346-359), but were wrongly referred by him to the year 726, whereas they were really written about 729, according to Jaffé, or within the last four months of 730, according to Pagi, xii. 345, 390. Their genuineness has been questioned, but is generally allowed. Walch, x. 174; Schröckh, xx. 535-6.

[z] The mistake will be readily seen.

800 years, so he himself had cast out images after a like time; and the pope, without any historical question, makes him welcome to the supposed parallel. It would, he says, be less evil to be called a heretic than an iconoclast; for the infamy of the heretic is known to few, and few understand his offence; but here the guilt is palpable and open as day. Leo had proposed a council, as a means of settling the question; but he is told that the proposal is idle, inasmuch as, if a council were gathered, he is unfit to take the part of a religious emperor in it. To say, as Leo had said, "I am emperor and priest," might become one who had protected and endowed the church, but not one who had plundered it, and had drawn people away from the pious contemplation of images to frivolous amusements; emperors are for secular matters, priests for spiritual. The pope mocks at the threat of carrying him off to Constantinople; he has but to withdraw twenty-four furlongs from the walls of Rome into Campania, and his enemies would have to pursue the winds. Why, it had been asked, had the six general councils said nothing of images? As well, replies Gregory, might you ask why they said nothing of common food and drink; images are matters of traditional and unquestioned use; the bishops who attended the councils carried images with them. The emperor is exhorted to repent and is threatened with judgments; he is charged to take warning from the fate of the Monothelite Constans, and from the glory of that prince's victims, the martyrs Maximus and Martin.

The sequel of Gregory's proceedings is matter of controversy. Extreme Romanists and their extreme opponents agree in stating that the pope excommunicated the emperor, withdrew his Italian subjects from their allegiance, and forbade the payment of tribute—by the rightful exercise of Apostolical authority, according to one party; by an anti-Christian usurpation, according to the other.[a] But more temperate inquirers have shown that these representations are incorrect. The popes of that age made no pretension to the right of dethroning princes or absolving subjects from their allegiance. Gregory, in his second letter, expressly disclaims the power of interfering with the sovereign, while he denies that the emperor is entitled to interfere with the Church.[b] The story as to the with-

[a] Baronius (730. 5) says that the pope, after long forbearance, found that it was time to lay the axe to the root of the tree, and to say, "Cut it down;" thus giving his successors an example not to suffer obstinately heretical princes to reign. See also Bellarmine, as quoted by Gieseler, II. i. 33; and, on the extreme protestant side, Spanheim, 732-4. The foundation of this account comes from the Greek writers, as Theophanes, 621-9.

[b] Walch, x. 249.

drawal of tribute seems to have grown out of the fact of a popular resistance to an impolitic increase of taxation.[e] Although Gregory condemned iconoclasm, it appears that he did not pronounce any excommunication against the emperor; and, even if he excommunicated him, the sentence would have been unheeded by the Church of Constantinople. The utmost that can be established, therefore, appears to be, that, by raising a cry against Leo as a heretic and a persecutor, he rendered him odious to his Italian subjects, and so paved the way for that separation from the empire which followed within half a century.[d]

In the following year, Gregory II. was succeeded by a third pope of the same name, who was confirmed in his office by the exarch.[e] Gregory III., a Syrian by birth,[f] was zealous in the cause of images, and laboured to increase the popular veneration of them. He remonstrated with Leo against his iconoclastic proceedings, and held a council of ninety-eight bishops, which anathematised all the enemies of images, but without mentioning the emperor by name.[g] Leo, indignant at the pope's audacity, imprisoned his envoys, and resolved to send a fleet to reduce Italy into better subjection. But the fleet was disabled by storms, and the emperor was obliged to content himself with confiscating the papal revenues (or "patrimony") in Sicily, Calabria, and other parts of his dominions, and transferring Greece and Illyricum from the Roman patriarchate to that of Constantinople.[h]

Feb. 731.

Nov. 731.

A.D. 733.

Gregory and Leo both died in 741. The emperor was succeeded by his son Constantine, whose reign extended to the unusual length of thirty-four years. This prince (who is commonly distinguished by the name *Copronymus*, derived from his having polluted the baptismal font)[i] is charged by the ecclesiastical writers with monstrous vices, and with the practice of magical arts;[k] while his apologists contend that he was remarkably chaste and temperate.[m] The characteristics which are beyond all controversy, are his vigour, his ability, and his cruelty.[n] In war he success-

[e] Pagi, xii. 390; Walch, x. 249 (who, however, questions whether there were any *new* tax); Milman, ii. 212.

[d] See Nat. Alex. xi. 169-174; De Marca, III. xi. 3; Pagi, xii. 390; Walch, x. 263-275, 280-2; Giannone, vol. i. pp. 350-2; Gibbon, iv. 173-4; Schröckh, xix. 522-7; xx. 531; note in Mosheim, ii. 164; Milman, ii. 210-2.

[e] Milman, ii. 212.

[f] Anastas. 158.

[g] Ibid.; Walch, x. 175; Schröckh, xx. 548.

[h] Pagi, xii. 731; Walch, x. 262; Schlosser, 190-5; Gieseler, II. i. 33.

[i] Theophanes, 613.

[k] Theophan. 636, 685, 694.

[m] Basnage, 1356-7; Walch, x. 361.

[n] Theophan. 683-5.

fully defended his empire against Saracens, Bulgarians, and other enemies, and under him its internal administration was greatly improved.[o]

The Saracen war and the discontents arising out of the question as to images, encouraged the emperor's brother-in-law, Artavasdus, to pretend to the throne; it would seem, indeed, that he was almost forced into this course by the jealousy of Constantine.[p] Artavasdus appealed to the popular affection for images, and restored them in all places of which he got possession. He was crowned by the patriarch Anastasius, who, holding the cross in his hands, publicly swore that Constantine had avowed to him a belief that our Lord was a mere man, born in the ordinary way.[q] Zacharias, the successor of Gregory III., acknowledged Artavasdus as emperor;[r] but, after having maintained his claim for three years, the rival of Constantine was put down, and he and his adherents were punished with great severity.[s] Anastasius was blinded, and was exhibited in the hippodrome, mounted on an ass, with his face towards the tail; yet, after this, Constantine restored him to the patriarchate, by way, it would seem, of proclaiming his contempt for the whole body of the clergy.[t]

It is said that Constantine expressed Nestorian opinions, and a disbelief in the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints. But if so, the words were spoken in conferences which were intended to be secret; and it was the emperor's policy to feel his way carefully before taking any public step in matters of religion.[u] On the question as to images, he wished to strengthen himself by the authority of a general council, and summoned one to meet in the year 754, having in the preceding year desired that, by way of preparation, the subject should be discussed by the provincial assemblies of bishops.[x] The see of Constantinople was then vacant by the death of Anastasius—a circumstance which may have tended to secure the ready compliance of some who aspired to fill it.[y] The remaining three patriarchs of the East were under the Mahometan dominion, and Stephen of Rome disregarded the imperial summons. In the absence of all the patriarchs, therefore, the bishops of Ephesus and Perga presided over the council,

[o] Gibbon, iv. 411-2; Schlosser, 222-4.
[p] Schlosser, 201.
[q] Theophan. 639.
[r] Schröckh, xix. 513.
[s] Theophan. 647-8.
[t] Theophan. 648; Milman, ii. 169.
[u] Theophan. 671, 678; Neander, v. 307. See Gfrörer, ii. 139.
[x] Basnage, 1354.
[y] This remark of Schlosser (213) seems more reasonable than that of Spanheim, (754)—that, if Constantine had wished to influence the Council, he would have filled the patriarchal throne with a tool.

which was held in a palace on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, with the exception of the final sitting, which was in the church of the Blachernæ.[z] The number of bishops, although collected from the emperor's dominions only, amounted to three hundred and thirty-eight,[a] and their decisions, after sessions which lasted from February to August, are described as unanimous—a proof rather of the subjection in which the episcopate was held than of any real conviction.

The assembled bishops professed to rest their judgment on the authority of the fathers, from whose writings extracts were read. They declared all representations made for religious purposes by the art of painter or sculptor to be presumptuous, pagan, and idolatrous.[b] Those who make such representations of the Saviour, it is said, either limit the incomprehensible God to the bounds of created flesh, or confound the natures, like Eutyches, or deny the Godhead, like Arius, or, with Nestorius, separate it from the manhood so as to make two persons.[c] The eucharist alone is declared to be a proper image of the Saviour—the union of the Divine grace with the material elements typifying that of the Godhead with His human form.[d] All images, therefore, are to be removed out of churches. Bishops, priests, or deacons contravening the decisions of the council, whether by invoking images, by worshipping them, by setting them up, or by secretly keeping them, are to be deposed; monks and lay persons offending in like manner are to be excommunicated.[e] But it was ordered that no one should deface or meddle with sacred vessels or vestments, on pretext of their being adorned with figures, unless by permission of the emperor or of the patriarch; and that no person in authority should despoil churches on this account, as had already been done in some instances.[f] With a view, perhaps, of clearing themselves from the aspersions which were thrown on the emperor's faith, the bishops formally declared the lawfulness of invoking the Blessed Virgin and the saints.[g] And they pronounced anathemas against all religious art,[h] anathematising by name some noted defenders of images—Germanus, George of Cyprus, and John of Damascus, whom they designated by the name of *Mansour*, loaded with a

[z] Schlosser, 213. Its definitions are in the sixth session of the second Council of Nicæa, Hard. iv. 325, seqq.

[a] Hard. iv. 345.

[b] Hard. iv. 380, 415.

[c] Hard. iv. 360-1.

[d] Hard. iv. 368-9. The inconsistency of this with the later Roman doctrine is evident, as otherwise the humanity would be *docetic*.

[e] Hard. iv. 416-7.

[f] Hard. iv. 420-1.

[g] Hard. iv. 429-432; Gieseler, II. i. 6.

[h] Hard. iv. 424, seqq.

profusion of dishonourable epithets, and denounced with a threefold curse.[i]

Fortified by the decisions of the council, Constantine now ordered that all images should be removed. For the religious paintings on church-walls, he ordered that other subjects, such as birds and fruits, should be substituted.[k] He required the clergy and the more noted monks to subscribe the decrees of the synod;[m] and at a later time an oath against images was exacted from all the inhabitants of the empire.[n] It does not appear that any of the bishops refused to comply; but the monks were violent and obstinate in their resistance, and the emperor endeavoured to subdue them by the most barbarous cruelties.[o] The zeal of the monks in behalf of images provoked him even to attempt the extirpation of monasticism by compelling them to abandon their profession. Thus we read that a number of monks were compelled to appear in the hippodrome at Constantinople, each holding by the hand a woman of disreputable character, and so to stand while the populace mocked at them and spat on them.[p] The new patriarch, Constantine, whom the emperor had presented to the council in that character on the last day of its meeting,[q] was obliged publicly to forswear images, and, in violation of the vows which he had taken as a monk, to attend the banquets of the palace, to eat and drink freely, to wear garlands, to witness the gross spectacles, and to listen to the indecent language and music in which the emperor delighted. Monasteries were destroyed, converted into barracks, or applied to other secular uses.[r] The governor of the Thracian Theme, Michael Lachanadraco,[s] distinguished himself by the energy of his proceedings against the monks. He assembled a great number of them in a plain, and told them that such of them as were inclined to obey the emperor and himself must forthwith put on a white dress and take wives; while those who should refuse were to lose their eyes and to be banished to Cyprus. Some of them complied, but the greater part suffered the penalty. Lachanadraco put many monks to death; he anointed the beards of some with a mixture of oil and wax, and then set them on fire;

[i] Hard. iv. 437; Theophan. 643.

[k] Theophan. 659. Hence a writer speaks of him as having turned a church into ὀπωροφυλάκιον καὶ ὀρνεοσκοπεῖον. Neander, v. 303.

[m] Schröckh, xx. 561-3.

[n] A.D. 766. Walch, x. 381. Neander, v. 307, supposes that it was only enforced in Constantinople.

[o] See Theophan. 684; Schröckh, xx. 564, seqq.

[p] Theophan. 675-6.

[q] Theophan. 659.

[r] Theophan. 675, 684.

[s] Theophan. 684-5.

he burnt up monasteries, sold the plate, books, cattle, and other property which belonged to them, and remitted the price to the emperor, who publicly thanked him for his zeal, and recommended him as an example to other governors.[t] Relics were to some extent involved in the fate of images, although not so much as consistency might have seemed to require.[u] Lachanadraco seized all which he found carried about the person, and punished the wearers as impious and disobedient. The relics of St. Euphemia, at Chalcedon, which were famous for exuding a fragrant balsam, were thrown into the sea, and the place where they had been preserved was defiled. But it is said that they were carried by the waves to Lemnos, where visions indicated the spot in which they were to be found, and secured their preservation until more favourable times.[x]

The monks, on their part, no doubt did much to provoke the emperor and his officers to additional cruelty by violent and fanatical behaviour. Thus, one, named Andrew, made his way into the presence of Constantine, and upbraided him, as a new Valens and Julian, for persecuting Christ in his members and in his images. For this audacity Andrew was scourged in the hippodrome, and was afterwards strangled.[y] Another famous sufferer was Stephen, who had lived as a monk for sixty years. He boldly defied the emperor; he remained unshaken by banishment or tortures, and, by way of illustrating the manner in which insults offered to images might be supposed to affect those whom they represent, he produced a coin stamped with the emperor's head, threw it on the ground, and trod on it. In consequence of this act he was imprisoned; but the sympathy of his admirers was displayed so warmly that Constantine was provoked to exclaim, "Am I, or is this monk, emperor of the world?" The words were caught up as a hint by some courtiers, who rushed to the prison and broke it open. Stephen was dragged through the streets, by a rope tied to one of his feet, until he was dead, and his body was then torn in pieces.[z]

The patriarch Constantine, after all his compliances, was accused of having held treasonable communications with Stephen, and of having spoken disrespectfully of the emperor. He was

[t] Theophan. 688-690. Spanheim sets off the *dragoons* of Louis XIV.'s time against this iconoclastic *draco*. Basnage, by his tone in speaking of persecution carried on by iconoclasts, shows not a little of that persecuting spirit which he would have reprobated in the opposite party.

[u] Gieseler, II. i. 5.

[x] Theophan. 679.

[y] Theophan. 363, ed. Paris; Basnage, 1356.

[z] Theophan. 674; Baron. 754. 26, seqq., with Pagi's notes; 762. 3; 765. 6-10; 767. 9-19; Schlosser, 228.

banished to an island, and Nicetas, an eunuch of Slavonic origin, was raised to the patriarchate in his stead. In the second year of his banishment, Constantine was brought back to the capital. After having been beaten until he could not walk, he was carried into the cathedral, where the charges against him were read aloud, and at every count of the indictment an imperial functionary struck him on the face. He was then forced to stand in the pulpit, while Nicetas pronounced his excommunication, after which he was stripped of the pall, the ensign of his ecclesiastical dignity, and was led backwards out of the church. On the following day he was carried into the hippodrome. His hair, eyebrows, and beard were plucked out; he was set on an ass, with his face towards the tail, which he was compelled to hold with both hands, and his nephew, whose nose had been cut off, led the animal around, while the spectators hooted at and spat on the fallen patriarch. He was then thrown violently to the ground, his neck was trodden on, and he lay prostrate, exposed to the jeers of the rabble, until the games of the day were over. A few days later, some patricians were sent to question him as to the emperor's orthodoxy, and as to the decisions of the council against images. The wretched man, thinking to soothe his persecutor's rage, expressed approval of everything. "This," they said, "was all that we wished to hear further from thy impure mouth; now begone to cursing and darkness!" He was immediately beheaded, and his head, after having been publicly exposed for three days, was thrown, with his body, into the place where suicides and excommunicated persons were buried.[a]

A.D. 767.

These details have been given as a specimen of the cruelties which are ascribed to Constantine Copronymus. To the end of his reign he was unrelenting in his enmity against the worshippers of images. In the year 775, while on a military expedition, he was seized with a burning pain in his legs, which (it is said) forced from him frequent cries that he already felt the pains of hell. He died at sea, on his way to Constantinople.[b]

[a] Theophan. 677-683.

[b] Theophan. 693-4.

CHAPTER V.

ST. BONIFACE.

A.D. 716–755.

Among the missionary enterprises of the Anglo-Saxons had been some attempts to convert the nations of Northern Germany. Suidbert, one of the original companions of Willibrord, was consecrated in England during his master's first visit to Rome, and went forth to preach to the Boructuarians, who occupied a territory between the Ems and the Yssel; but the disorders of the country obliged him to withdraw from it, and he afterwards laboured on the Lower Rhine.[a] Two brothers, named Hewald, and distinguished from each other by the epithets White and Black, are also celebrated as having penetrated into the country of the Old Saxons, and having there ended their lives by martyrdom.[b] But no established missionary success had been achieved to the east of the Rhine in the lower part of its course until the time of Boniface, "the Apostle of the Germans."[c]

This missionary, whose original name was Winfrid,[d] was born at Crediton, in Devonshire, of a noble and wealthy family, about the year 680.[e] It was intended that he should follow a secular career, but the boy was early influenced by the discourse of some monks who visited his father's house, and at the age of seven he entered a monastery at Exeter, from which he afterwards removed to that of Nutscelle (Nutshalling or Nursling) in Hampshire.[f] Here he became famous for his ability as a preacher and as an expositor of Scripture.[g] He was employed in important ecclesias-

[a] Bed. v. 11; Rettberg, ii. 395, 423, 525.

[b] Bed. v. 10. The details of the story are legendary. See Rettberg, ii. 397-9.

[c] Gieseler, I. ii. 507; Rettberg, i. 309. I have used Dr. Giles' edition of St. Boniface, not for its merit, but for its convenient size. The editor identifies Mayence with *Metz!* (pp. 6, 8, 21.) The Life by Willibald is also in Mabillon, iv., and in Pertz, ii. Mabillon gives the Life by Othlon; Pertz gives extracts from it, and from an anonymous writer of Mentz.

[d] The name of Boniface is generally said to have been given to him by the Pope at his consecration. But it occurs earlier, and was probably assumed when he became a monk. Luden, v. 454; Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 338; Rettberg, i. 334-5.

[e] Not later than 683. See Rettberg, i. 336.

[f] Willibald, 1-2; Kemble, ii. 452. The disappearance of Nutscelle from the list of English monasteries is traced to the ravages of the Danes. M'Cabe's Catholic History of England, i. 616.

[g] Willib. 2-3.

tical business, and had the prospect of rising to eminence in the church of his own country; but he was seized with an earnest desire to labour for the extension of the Gospel, and, with two companions, he crossed the sea to Frisia, in the year 716.[h] The state of things in that country was unfavourable for his design. Charles Martel, the son of Pipin of Heristal by a concubine, had possessed himself of the mayoralty of the palace in Austrasia, and was now engaged in war with Radbod, who had made an alliance with Ragenfrid, the mayor of the Neustrian palace.[i] The pagan prince had destroyed many churches and monasteries, and, although he admitted Boniface to an interview, he refused him permission to preach in his dominions.[k] Boniface therefore returned to Nutscelle, where the monks, on the occurrence of a vacancy in the headship of their house, were desirous to elect him abbot. But his missionary zeal induced him to withstand their importunities; by the assistance of his bishop, Daniel of Winchester, he secured the appointment of another abbot, and in the spring of 717 he set out for Rome.[m] A letter from Daniel procured him a kind reception from Gregory II. who held many conferences with him during the following winter; and in 718 Boniface left Rome, carrying with him a large supply of relics, with a letter[n] in which the pope authorised him to preach to the heathens of Germany wherever he might find an opportunity. After having surveyed Bavaria and Thuringia, he was induced by tidings of Radbod's death to go again into Frisia, where for three years he laboured under Willibrord. The aged bishop wished to appoint him his successor; but Boniface declined the honour, on the ground that, as he was not yet fifty years old, he was unfit for so high an office, and that he must betake himself to the sphere for which the pope had especially appointed him.[o] He therefore took leave of Willibrord, and passed into Hessia. Two local chiefs, Detdic and Dierolf, who, although professing Christianity, were worshippers of idols, granted him leave to establish himself at Amanaburg, on the Ohm (*Amana*[p]), where in a short time he reclaimed them from their heathenish practices, and baptised many thousands of Hessians. The pope, on receiving a

A.D. 719.

A.D. 722.

[h] Pagi, xii. 272.

[i] Pagi, xii. 250, 266; Sismondi, ii. 112.

[k] Willib. 4.

[m] Willib. 5.

[n] Ep. 2.

[o] Willib. 6. Neander (v. 61) connects with this occasion a passage in the letter of Bugga to Boniface (Ep. 3), and supposes that Boniface acted on an intimation received in a dream. But the connexion seems questionable.

[p] Willib. 7. See Rettberg, i. 339-340.

report of this success, summoned Boniface to Rome, and, after having exacted a formal profession of faith, ordained him as a regionary (or missionary) bishop.[q] On this occasion he swore Nov. 30, on the body of St. Peter to obey the apostle, and the 723. pope as his vicar. The oath (which was a novelty as imposed on a missionary, although, with some necessary changes, it was the same which had long been required of bishops within the proper patriarchate of Rome[r]) bound him in no wise to consent to anything against the unity of the Catholic Church; in all things to keep his faith to the apostle, and to the interests of the Roman see; to have no communion or fellowship with bishops who might act contrary to the institutions of the holy fathers, but to check such persons, if possible, or otherwise to report them faithfully to his lord the pope.[s]

Boniface received from the pope a code of regulations for the government of his church, probably the collection of Dionysius Exiguus; and, having learnt by experience the importance of securing the countenance of princes for missionary undertakings, he carried with him a letter from Gregory to Charles Martel, who, under the name of the effete descendants of Clovis, was the virtual sovereign of their kingdom.[t] He was also furnished by Gregory with letters to the nations among which his labours were to be employed.[u] Charles Martel received the missionary coldly; such enterprises as that of Boniface had no interest for the rude warrior,[x] and the clergy of his court were not likely to bespeak his favour for one whose life and thoughts widely differed from their own. Boniface, however, obtained from Charles the permission which he desired to preach beyond the Rhine, with a letter of protection, which proved to be very valuable.[y]

In Hessia and Thuringia, the countries to which Boniface now repaired, Christianity had already been long preached, but by isolated teachers, and without any regular system.[z] The belief and the practice of the converts were still largely mixed with pa-

[q] Pagi, xii. 302.

[r] See De Marca, VI. vii. 6; Schröckh, xix. 173-6; Neander, v. 66; Gieseler, II. i. 22.

[s] The oath is given in Bonif. ii. 9; Hardouin, iii. 1857; Gieseler, II. i. 22, &c.

[t] Ep. 5. To the ordinary accounts of the "do-nothing" Merovingian kings (*e.g.* that given by Einhard. Vit. Carol. i.), Theophanes adds the Byzantine idea as to their long hair—that it grew along their backs, as in hogs! p. 619.

[u] Epp. 6-10.

[x] M. Michelet (ii. 11) questions whether he were a Christian at all—but on no better ground than that the epithet *Martel* reminds the historian of the *hammer* ascribed to Thor! Against this, see Martin, ii. 252, 279; the name does not appear to have been given to Charles till two centuries later (Sism. ii. 132), or, according to Luden, till the eleventh century. iv. 469.

[y] Ep. 11; Ep. 12, p. 38; Rettberg, i. 343.

[z] Willib. 8; Rettberg, i. 346-7; ii. 310.

ganism; Boniface even speaks of priests who offered sacrifices to Woden.[a] The preachers had for the most part proceeded from the Irish Church; they had brought with them its peculiar ideas as to the limitation of the episcopal rights;[b] they were unrestrained by any discipline or by any regard for unity; they owned no subjection to Rome, and were under the jurisdiction of no bishop.[c] Boniface often complains of those preachers as "fornicators and adulterers"[d] —words which may in some cases imply a charge of real immorality, but which in general clearly mean nothing more than that the Irish missionaries held the doctrine of their native church as to the lawfulness of marriage for the clergy.[e] He speaks, too, of some who imposed on the people by pretensions to extraordinary asceticism.[f] With these rival teachers he was involved in serious and lasting contentions.

Among the collection of Boniface's correspondence is a letter from his old patron, Daniel of Winchester,[g] containing advice for the conduct of his missionary work. The bishop tells him that, in discussions with the heathen, he ought not to question the genealogies of their gods, but to argue from them that beings propagated after the fashion of mankind must be not gods but men. The argument is to be urged by tracing back the genealogies to the beginning; by asking such questions as—When was the first god generated? To which sex did this god belong? Has the generation of gods come to an end? If it has ceased, why? Is the world older than the gods? If so, who governed it before they existed? The missionary must argue mildly, and must avoid all appearance of insult or offence. He must contrast the truth of

[a] Ep. 71, p. 169. Rettberg thinks that these were not Christians who had fallen into idolatry, but heathens who, without renouncing their own religion, had taken up some Christian forms. (ii. 579.) See Schmidt, i. 408.

[b] In Ireland, as has been shown by the Rev. R. King (Memoir on the Primacy of Armagh—Armagh, 1854), and as will be explained hereafter (Book II. c. vii. 2), there was as yet no diocesan episcopacy, and the jurisdiction was separate from the order of bishop.

[c] Willib. 8; Rettberg, i. 317.

[d] *E. g.* Epp. 12, 27, 49.

[e] Schröckh, xix. 185; Theiner, i. 409, 414; Rettberg, i. 320-3.

[f] Rettberg, i. 313. In the letter by which Gregory II. recommended Boniface to the people and clergy of Germany (Ep. 10), it is said that he is not to acknowledge *Africanos* pretending to holy orders, because some of them have often been proved to be Manichæans, and others to be rebaptised (*i. e.* Donatists). Neander (v. 62), Rettberg (i. 312), and others, suppose this to have been carelessly copied by a scribe from a form of older date (it occurs almost in the same words in an epistle of Gregory the Great, ii. 37). Ozanam, however, thinks that the prohibition was applicable to the circumstances of Germany in the time of Boniface, and that the ascetic pretenders of whom Boniface complains were Manichæans. (Civil. Chrét. 192.) But he does not explain how the African church of the eighth century could have sent forth such persons, how it is that Donatists are also mentioned in that age, or how it is that the same words are found in Gregory the Great.

[g] Ep. 14.

Christianity with the absurdities of the pagan mythology. He must ask how it is that the gods allow Christians to possess the fairest places of the earth, while their own votaries are confined to cold and barren tracts; he is to dwell on the growth of the Christian church from nothing to the predominance which it has already attained.

It would seem, however, that Boniface rarely had occasion to enter into arguments of this sort, but was obliged to rely on others of a more palpable kind.[h] He found that an oak near Geismar, sacred to the thunder-god Donar,[i] was held in great reverence by the Hessians, and that the impression which his words made on the people was checked by their attachment to this object of ancestral veneration. He therefore, at the suggestion of some converts, resolved to cut down the tree. A multitude of pagans stood around, expecting the vengeance of the gods to show itself, and ready to fall on the missionary and his companions. But when Boniface had hardly begun his operations, a violent gust of wind shook the branches, and the oak fell to the ground, broken into four equal pieces. The pagans on this renounced their gods, and with the wood of the tree Boniface built a chapel in honour of St. Peter.[k]

He now made great progress, founded churches and monasteries, and was reinforced by many monks and nuns from his native church, who assisted him in the labours of conversion and Christian education.[m] Gregory III., soon after his elevation to the popedom, in 732, conferred on him the pall of an archbishop;[n] and when in 738 Boniface paid a third visit to Rome, he was received with the honour due to a missionary who had by that time baptised a hundred thousand converts.[o] On his return northwards, he was induced by Odilo, duke of Bavaria, to remain for a time in that country, where he had already laboured about three years before.[p] He found there a general profession of Christianity; but there was only one bishop, Vivilus by name. There was no system of ecclesiastical government; and, as in other parts of Germany, he had to contend with the rivalry of the irregular missionaries from Ireland.[q] He divided the country into four dioceses—Salzburg, Passau, Ratisbon,

A.D. 739.

[h] Rettberg, i. 407-8.

[i] The *Thor* of Scandinavian mythology. Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie, 62-3, 172. As being the god of thunder he is called *Jupiter* (Willib. 8), whence Rettberg wrongly substitutes the *chief* god, Woden, for him. i. 314.

[k] Willib. 8.

[m] Rettberg, i. 403.

[n] Ep. 24; Willib. 8.

[o] Ep. 46; Willib. 9.

[p] Pagi, xii. 428; Rettberg, i. 346.

[q] Epp. 45-6; Willib. 9.

and Freisingen;[r] and, having thus organised the Bavarian church, he returned to the more especial scene of his labours.

The name of Charles Martel is memorable in the history of the Church and of the world for having turned back the course of Mahometan conquest. The Saracens of Spain had overrun the south of France, had made their way as far as the Loire, and were marching against Tours, with the intention of plundering the treasures which the devotion of centuries had accumulated around the shrine of St. Martin, when they were met by Charles, at the head of an army collected from many races—Franks, Germans, Gauls, men of the north, and others. His victory near Poitiers (although the slaughter has been vastly exaggerated by legendary writers)[s] put a stop for ever to the progress of their arms towards the north; they were weakened by internal dissensions in Spain, and Charles, following up his advantage, succeeded in driving them back beyond the Pyrenees.[t] But the vast benefit which he thus conferred on Christendom was purchased at a cost which for the time pressed heavily on the Church of France. In order to meet the exigencies of the war, he seized the treasures of churches, and rewarded the chiefs who followed him with the temporalities of bishopricks and abbeys; so that, notwithstanding his great services to the Christian cause, his memory is branded by the French ecclesiastical writers as that of a profane and sacrilegious prince, and a synod held at Kiersy in the year 858, assured one of his descendants that for this sin Eucherius, bishop of Orleans, had seen him tormented "in the lower hell."[u]

A.D. 732.

Boniface, although he found the name of the Frankish mayor a powerful assistance in his labours beyond the Rhine,[x] was thwarted at the Frankish court by the nobles who had got possession of ecclesiastical revenues, and by the rude, secular, fighting and hunting bishops, who were most congenial to the character of Charles.[y] In a letter to Daniel of Winchester, he complains of being obliged to have intercourse with such persons. The

[r] Rettberg, i. 349-350.

See Sismondi, ii. 132; Martin, ii. 272-5; Hallam, Supplem. Notes, 24; Luden, iv. 105-6. The Arabian accounts ascribe the defeat to the Divine vengeance for the cruelties of which the invaders had been guilty. Conde, Dominacion de los Arabes en España, 44, ed. Paris, 1840.

[t] Gibbon, v. 186-9.

[u] Ep. ad Ludov. regem Germaniæ, ap. Hard. v. 469. The story is full of anachronisms: *e. g.* the saint who is said to have seen the sufferings of Charles after death, himself died before him. See Baron. 739. 2; 741. 16-21; Pagi, xii. 466-470; Mabillon, iii. 595.

[x] Martin, ii. 252.

[y] Epp. 15, 49.

bishop in reply wisely advises him, on scriptural authority, to keep himself pure, and to bear with such faults in others as it is not in his power to amend.[z]

Both Gregory III. and Charles Martel died in 741. The new pope, Zacharias, extended Boniface's power by authorising him to reform the whole Frankish church.[a] The sons of Charles were glad to avail themselves of the assistance of Rome in a work of which they felt the necessity;[b] and from Carloman, who had succeeded to the mayoralty of Austrasia, while Pipin held that of Neustria, Boniface received an amount of support which he had hitherto in vain endeavoured to obtain.[c] He now erected four bishopricks for Hesse and Thuringia;[d] and in 742, at the request of Carloman (as he says), was held a council for the reformation of the church—the first Austrasian council which had met for eighty years.[e] This council was for some years followed by others, collected from one or from both divisions of the Frankish territory. They were not, however, composed of ecclesiastics only, but were mixed assemblies of the national estates,[f] and, while Boniface was acknowledged in his high office as the pope's commissioner, the decrees were set forth by the Frankish princes in their own name,[g] and appointments which had been already made by the papal authority were again made, afresh and independently, by the secular power. Even the jurisdiction of Boniface over other bishops was thus granted anew to him.[h] Their canons were directed towards the establishment of order in the church by providing for annual synods, by forbidding ecclesiastics to hunt, to hawk, to serve in war; by the enforcement of celibacy on the clergy; by subjecting the clergy to the bishops, and discountenancing such as were under no regular discipline.[i] An attempt was made to recover to their proper uses the ecclesiastical revenues which had been alienated by Charles Martel. The first council ordered their restoration,[k] but this was not to be so easily effected. The council of the following year, held at Lestines, in the Hennegau, near Binch, was reduced to attempt a compromise, by allowing that, in consideration of the A.D. 743.

[z] Epp. 12-13.
[a] Ep. 55.
[b] Planck, ii. 726.
[c] Rettberg, i. 346-7.
[d] Epp. 49, 50; Rettberg, i. 351.
[e] Ep. 49; Pagi, xii. 446, 478. There had been more recent synods in Neustria. Rettberg, i. 380.
[f] Rettberg, i. 354, 363.
[g] *E. g.* Conc. Germ. I. ap. Hard. iii. 1919; Conc. Suesson. ib. 1932-4.
[h] Conc. Germ. c. 1, ap. Hard. iii. 1920; Rettberg, i. 354. The genuineness of these councils has been denied without reason by some Romanists, on account of the position assigned in them to the secular power. See Schröckh, xix. 204.
[i] *E. g.* Conc. Germ. cc. 1, 3, 4; Hard. iii. 1920.
[k] Can. 1. See Epp. 47, 63.

wars and of other circumstances, the property should for a time be retained by the lay holders, but that for each *casata* a *solidus* should be paid to the ecclesiastical owners.[m] But in the later councils the subject does not appear, and it would seem that the attempt was given up as hopeless.[n] The councils also made enactments for the suppression of heathen practices,[o] such as divination, the use of amulets, *needfire* (i. e. the production of fire by the friction of wood and tow),[p] and the offering of sacrifices, whether to the old pagan deities, or to the saints who, with some converts, had taken their place—practices of which some, with a remarkable tenacity, have kept their hold on the northern nations even to our own day.[q]

In 742 Boniface laid the foundation of the great abbey of Fulda, by means of Sturmi, a noble Bavarian, whom he had trained up in his seminary at Fritzlar.[r] The original intention was unconnected with educational or missionary plans—to provide a place for ascetic retirement. Sturmi and his companions were charged to seek out a remote and lonely position in the Buchonian forest, between the four nations to which their master had preached; and, when they had fixed on a suitable spot, on the banks of the river Fulda, they had to clear it by cutting down trees, which furnished them with materials for a little chapel.[s] Sturmi was afterwards sent to Monte Cassino and other Italian monasteries, in order that he might become acquainted with the best monastic systems,[t] and the rule established at Fulda was more rigid than that of St. Benedict. The monks were never to eat flesh; their strongest drink was to be a thin beer,[u] although wine

[m] Conc. Liptin. c. 2. In the Ripuarian laws the solidus is reckoned as the value of two oxen. Ozanam, 138.

[n] Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 347.

[o] Conc. Germ. I. c. 5; Conc. Liptin. c. 4, Conc. Suesson. c. 6.

[p] *Nodfyr*, from *nöthen*, to compel, because the fire was forced out of the wood. (Würdtwein, ap. Giles, ii. 255.) On the manner of producing it, see Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie, 570, where a great mass of learning on the subject is collected. In the 17th century it was used in Aberdeenshire, where it was stigmatised as "a *highland* practice." (Presbytery book of Strathbogie, pub. by the Spalding Club, 1843, p. 117.) Grimm (567) quotes Logan's 'Scottish Gael' for evidence that it is still used in Caithness.

[q] See Grimm, *passim*; Rettberg, i. 370; W. Müller, Altdeutsche Religion, Götting. 1844, pp. 114, seqq. The curious 'Indiculus paganiarum vel superstitionum,' annexed to the canons of Lestines (Hard. iii. 1923, or Pertz, Leges, i. 19), was probably contemporary, although not the work of that council. The like is to be said of the vernacular form of baptismal professions and renunciations—"Forsachista Diaboke, &c."—where after the devil are mentioned the old pagan gods. (ibid.) Rettberg, i. 328, 360.

[r] Rettberg, i. 346; Egil, Vita S. Sturmii, ap. Pertz, ii. 366. Pagi places the foundation in 744. xii. 516-7.

[s] Vit. Sturm. p. 367.

[t] Vita, p. 372.

[u] Vita, 371. Pertz adds a note which looks significant—"Cf. Mémoires du Baron de Poellnitz!"

was afterwards allowed for the sick. They were to have no serfs, but were to subsist by the labour of their own hands.[x] The new foundation soon became important, and was extended to purposes beyond those which Boniface had had in view. Princes and nobles enriched it with gifts of land, and both from the Frankish kings and from the popes it enjoyed special privileges, although grave doubts have been cast on the documents by which some of these are said to have been conferred, and especially on the grant by which Zacharias is represented as exempting it from all jurisdiction save that of the apostolic see.[y]

Boniface continued to meet with difficulties. His scheme of a regular organisation, by which bishops were to be subject to metropolitans, and these to the successor of St. Peter, did not find favour with the Frankish prelates. Of three on whom the pope intended to confer the pall, and who had been persuaded to apply for it, two afterwards refused it, probably in consequence of having further considered the obligations to Rome which it involved.[z] And he still had to encounter the opposition of irregular or heretical teachers.

Of these the most noted were Adelbert and Clement.[a] Adelbert was of Gaulish descent, and had obtained uncanonical consecration as a bishop from some ignorant members of the order. He is described as affecting extraordinary sanctity, and the accounts of him lead us to suppose him a person of fanatical character. He relied much on a letter which was written in the name of the Saviour and was said to have been sent down from heaven.[b] He said that an angel had brought him some relics of surpassing sanctity from the ends of the earth. In opposition to the regular bishops and clergy, he held meetings in fields and at wells; and in such places he set up crosses and built little chapels. He opposed the practice of pilgrimage to Rome.[c] He prayed to angels of names before unknown.[d] He is said to have disparaged the saints and martyrs,

[x] Ep. 75; Rettberg, i. 371-4.

[y] Pertz, ii. 370; Bonif. Epp. 75-7, 95. See Schröckh, xix. 226-7. Rettberg regards these pieces as spurious or interpolated. Such exemptions as that said to have been granted by Zacharias were not known until later. Rettb. i. 613-622.

[z] Fleury, xlii. 37; Planck, ii. 727; Neander, v. 88; Gieseler, II. i. 35; Rettberg, i. 362.

[a] The chief sources of information respecting them are Bonif. Ep. 57, and Concil. Rom. ap. Hard. iii. 1935-41.

[b] It is not said that Adelbert was the writer of this letter. Walch (x. 24, 41) identifies it with a letter for which a like origin was pretended in the time of Gregory the Great and with one which was condemned in a capitulary of Charlemagne, A.D. 789. (Pertz, Leges, i. 65, c. 77.) The object of that letter was to enforce a rigid observance of the Lord's Day.

[c] Ep. 50.

[d] Conc. Rom. ap. Hard. iii. 1940.

refusing to dedicate churches in their honour, while, with a self-importance which, however inconsistent, is certainly not without parallels, he dedicated them in his own name instead;[e] and—whether from vanity or in order to ridicule the relics which Boniface had brought from Rome[f]—he distributed the parings of his own nails and hair among his admirers. These, it is said, spoke of his merits as something on which they might rely for aid; and, when they prostrated themselves at his feet, for the purpose of confessing their sins, he told them that it was needless—that he knew all things and had forgiven all their misdeeds, so that they might go home in peace, with the assurance of pardon.

While Adelbert gathered his sect in Austrasia, Clement was preaching in the German territory.[g] Of this person, who was a Scot from Ireland, we are told that he set at naught all canons and all ecclesiastical authority; that he despised the writings of the most esteemed fathers, such as Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory; that he had two sons born in "adultery" (*i. e.* in wedlock),[h] and yet considered himself to be a true Christian bishop; that he judaically held marriage with a brother's widow to be lawful; that he believed our Lord's descent into hell to have delivered the souls of unbelievers as well as believers; and that on the subject of predestination he held horrible opinions, contrary to the catholic faith.[i]

Boniface brought the case of Adelbert before a Neustrian council at Soissons in 744, and obtained a condemnation of the heretic, with an order that the crosses which he had erected should be burnt.[k] But in the following year Adelbert as well as Clement appears to have been in full activity. Boniface procured a censure of both from another council,[l] and reported the matter for investigation to Pope Zacharias, whom he requested to obtain from Carloman an order that they should be imprisoned, and debarred from communication with all faithful Christians.[m] Hereupon the documents of the case were examined by a Roman

[e] Rettberg is unnecessarily perplexed by the seeming inconsistency. (i. 315.) Walch supposes the story to have grown out of the circumstance that the name of "Adelbert's chapels" was popularly used. x. 47.

[f] Walch, x. 48.

[g] Rettberg, i. 324.

[h] Theiner, i. 416.

[i] Ep. 50. As might be expected, Walch (x. 64), Schröckh (xix. 214-6), and most especially Neander (v. 78; Mem. 467) and Dr. Bunsen (Zeichen der Zeit, i. 91-4), take up the cause of Adelbert and Clement, and strain their powers of conjecture to draw forth a favourable meaning from the unfavourable representations by which alone we know anything of these teachers.

[k] Capitul. Suesson. ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 21.

[l] Conc. German. III. ap. Hard. iii. 1933.

[m] Ep. 57.

synod, which sentenced Adelbert to be deposed, put to penance, and, in case of obstinacy, anathematised with all his followers; while Clement was to be forthwith deposed and anathematised.[n] Two years later, however, the two again appear; and it would seem that, besides enjoying a great amount of veneration with the common people, who had persecuted Boniface for his proceedings against Adelbert, they even had some influence over Carloman himself.[o] It was probably in consequence of this that Zacharias now advised a course of dealing with them which is hardly consistent with the decided condemnation before passed on them.[p] The further history of Clement is utterly unknown; as to Adelbert it is stated by a writer of questionable authority that he was imprisoned at Fulda, and made his escape from the abbey, but was murdered by some swineherds whom he met with in his flight.[q]

Another person with whom Boniface came into collision was an Irish ecclesiastic named Virgil.[r] Virgil, when ordered by him to rebaptise some persons at whose baptism the words of administration had been mutilated by an ignorant priest,[s] appealed against the order to Rome; and Zacharias pronounced that the sacrament was valid, inasmuch as the mistake proceeded not from heresy but only from grammatical ignorance. Some time after this, A.D. 745. Virgil was nominated to the see of Salzburg,[t] when Boniface objected to him that he held the existence of another world below ours, with a sun, a moon, and inhabitants of its own.[u]

[n] Conc. Rom. ap. Hard. iii. 1940-1; Bonif. Epp. 58, 60 (p. 129).

[o] Anon. Mogunt. ap. Pertz, ii. 354; Rettberg, i. 314.

[p] Ep. 64.

[q] Anon. Mogunt. ap. Pertz, ii. 355; Rettberg, i. 368-370.

[r] See Vit. S. Virgilii, ap. Mabill. iv. 309.

[s] The priest baptised "in nomine Patri*a*, et Fili*a*, et Spiritu*a* Sancta." Ep. 56; Hard. iii. 1888.

[t] Virgil administered the diocese for two (or, as Rettberg, ii. 234, argues, for *twenty-two*) years before receiving consecration; and in the meantime ordinations, &c. were performed for him by one of his countrymen named Dobda, who was in episcopal orders. At length Virgil yielded to the importunities of his flock and of the neighbouring bishops, and was consecrated in 767. (Canisius, ed. Basnage, III. ii. 287.) This is a remarkable confirmation of Mr. King's theory (see p. 98, note [b]) as to the peculiar system of the Irish church, and the more so, because Mr. King (as I have reason to believe) was not aware of it when he published his 'Memoir' His explanation of the Irish system disposes of the constructions put on the case by Rettberg (ii. 234) and others.

[u] The case of Virgil is celebrated as a parallel to that of Galileo—his opinion, according to those who so regard the matter, having been, that he believed the roundness of the earth and the existence of antipodes. Writers anxious for the credit of Rome reply that, whatever his opinion may really have been, the report which reached the pope was, that he held the existence of men belonging to a different species from ours —not partakers in the seed of Adam or in the Christian redemption. See Bayle, *art.* "Virgile de Salzbourg;" Neander, v. 86; Ozanam, 134; Whewell, Hist. of Inductive Sciences, i. 272, ed. 2; Rettberg, ii. 236; Rohrbacher, xi. 39-40. Some (as Pagi, xii. 538, 549) deny the

Zacharias condemned the opinion, and summoned Virgil to Rome; but it would seem that he was able to clear his orthodoxy, as he was consecrated to Salzburg and was eventually canonized.

The German church had now advanced beyond that stage in which its primate might fitly be a missionary, without any determinate see.[x] Boniface wished to fix himself at Cologne—probably with a view to Frisia, which, since the death of Willibrord, in 739, he had regarded as included within his legatine care.[y] But in 744, Gerold, bishop of Mentz, was slain in a warlike expedition against the Saxons. His son, Gewillieb, who until then had been a layman of Carloman's court, was consecrated to the see, and, in the following year, accompanied the Mayor of the Palace to war, with a resolution to avenge his father's death. He discovered the Saxon by whose hand it had been caused, and, while the Frankish and the Saxon armies were encamped on opposite banks of the Weser, invited him to a conference in the midst of the stream. The two rode into the water, and, at their meeting, the bishop stabbed the Saxon—an act which was the signal for a battle, in which the Franks were victorious. Gewillieb returned to his see as if he had done nothing inconsistent with his episcopal character; nor does it appear that any disapprobation of it was felt by Carloman or his nobles.[z] But Boniface, after having so lately exerted himself to procure the enactment of canons against clerical warriors, now felt himself bound to enforce them, and submitted the case of Gewillieb to a council, which declared the bishop guilty of blood. Gewillieb yielded, resigned his see, and spent the remainder of his life in the enjoyment of some lesser benefices; and Boniface was unwillingly obliged by the Frankish nobles to accept the bishoprick thus vacated as the seat of his metropolitan jurisdiction,[a] instead of that which he had wished for. The pope subjected to him the dioceses of Mentz, Worms, Spires, Tongres, Cologne, Utrecht, and all the nations of Germany which had received the Gospel through his labours.[b]

A.D. 745.

In 747 Carloman resigned his power, and became a monk on Mount Soracte, from which, feeling himself disquieted by the visits of his countrymen, he afterwards withdrew to Monte Cassino.[c]

identity of St. Virgil with the object of Boniface's suspicion; but Mabillon (iv. 308) and Lanigan (iii. 184) maintain it.

[x] Rettberg, i. 366.

[y] Pagi, xii. 523; Neander, v. 89.

[z] Anon. Mogunt. ap. Pertz, ii.

[a] Ep. 71, p. 174; Cane. Germ. III. ap. Hard. iii. 1954-6; Schröckh, xix. 232-3; Luden, iv. 167; Rettberg, i. 365-7.

[b] Ep. 72; Rettberg, i. 379.

[c] Einhard, Vit. Carol. 2; Mabillon, iv. 124-6; Baron. 747. 4-10.

This change, by which the whole power of the Frankish kingdom was thrown into the hands of Pipin, would seem to have operated to the disadvantage of Boniface.[d] It has been very generally believed that he officiated at the coronation of Pipin at Soissons, when the Mayor of the Palace at length assumed the name of King[e] (A.D. 752); but the evidence of this is open to much doubt, and it has even been argued that, instead of promoting, he opposed the revolution which transferred the crown from the descendants of Clovis to another dynasty.[f] The labours of his office began to weigh heavily on him. He had still to struggle against much opposition on the part of bishops and clergy;[g] in 752 he reports to Pope Stephen that thirty churches in his diocese had been burnt or demolished by pagans.[h] He had, with some difficulty, obtained permission from Rome to nominate a successor to the see of Mentz when he should feel the approach of death,[i] and, with Pipin's consent, he now raised to it his countryman and disciple Lull, who, however, had a much more limited authority than Boniface,[k] and did not receive the pall till twenty years later.[m] A.D. 753.

It had been Boniface's intention to spend his last days in his monastery of Fulda, but he felt himself once more attracted to Frisia, the scene of his early labours. He again set forth as a missionary bishop, descended the Rhine, and, having consecrated

[d] Rettberg, i. 184-5.

[e] Einhard, Annal. A.D. 750; Annal. Laurissens. A.D. 750 (Pertz, i. 138-9).

[f] This is Rettberg's view. A short time before the change, Boniface sent Lull to Rome on a mission so confidential that the purport of it could not safely be committed to writing. Rettberg argues that such a mission was more likely to have been against than in favour of the actual holder of power among the Franks, who wished to add the title to the reality of sovereignty—that Boniface was desirous to withhold the pope from acting on considerations of interest (i. 186). He compares the chronicles which name Boniface as having crowned Pipin with those which omit his name, and plausibly accounts for the insertion of the statement in the former class (i. 384-392). Boniface's share in the affair had before been denied by some Gallican writers. Ozanam makes no other reply to Rettberg as to the question whether Boniface promoted the change, than that, as he sees no wrong in the conduct ascribed to the archbishop, he thinks it unnecessary to clear him from it. He says that Boniface must have officiated at the coronation, because such ceremonies were new to the Franks, and must have been introduced from England. The necessity of this, however, is not evident, inasmuch as the rite was practised both in the eastern empire and in Spain; and moreover, the founder of the earlier dynasty appears to have been crowned by St. Remigius. (Testam. S. Remigii, ap. Flodoard, quoted by Lehuërou, 'Institutions Carolingiennes,' ii. 329.) The tone of Boniface's letter to the arch-chaplain Fulrad (Ep. 79) certainly seems to show that his relations with Pipin were not such as might have been expected if he had done the new king the essential service which is generally supposed. Rettberg, i. 384-5. Comp. Schröckh, xix. 234-6; Sismondi, ii. 164-5; Neander, v. 94-5; Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 349.

[g] Ep. 72.

[h] Epp. 78, 94.

[i] See Ep. 71, p. 174.

[k] Pagi, xii. 587.

[m] Rettberg, i. 575.

Eoban to the see of Utrecht,[n] laboured with his assistance among the Frisian tribes. Many thousands were baptised, and Boniface had appointed the day before Whit Sunday for the meeting of a large number of converts at a place near Dockum, in order that he might bestow on them the rite of confirmation. But instead of the neophytes whom he expected, an armed band of pagans appeared and surrounded his tent. The younger members of his party were seizing weapons for defence, but he exhorted them to give up the thoughts of preserving the life of this world, and to submit to death in the hope of a better life. The pagans massacred the whole company—fifty-two in number.[o] They carried off from the tent some chests which they supposed to be full of treasure, but which in reality contained books and relics; and it is said that, having drunk up a quantity of wine which they found, they were excited to quarrel about the division of the fancied spoil, and avenged the martyrs by almost exterminating each other.[p] Eoban had shared the fate of Boniface, but their missionary labours were continued by Gregory, abbot of Utrecht,[q] and the conversion of the Frisians was completed before the end of the century by Lebuin, Liudger, and others.[r]

June 5, 755.

The body of Boniface was conveyed up the Rhine to Mentz, and thence, in compliance with a wish which he had often expressed, to the abbey of Fulda; and, although no miracles are related of him during his lifetime (unless the destruction of the oak of Geismar be reckoned as an exception), his remains, both on the way to their resting-place and after they had been deposited there, are said to have been distinguished by abundant displays of miraculous power.[s] His name for ages drew pilgrims and wealth to Fulda, and he was revered as the Apostle of Germany—a title which he deserved, not as having been the first preacher of the Gospel in the countries where he laboured, but as the great agent in the establishment of Christianity among the Germans, as the organizer of the German Church. The Anglo-Saxon Church, from which he went forth, was immediately, and in a more especial manner than any other, a daughter of the Roman. Teutonic by language and kindred, Latin by principles and affection, it was peculiarly

[n] Willibald, 11; Mabillon, iv. 3; Rettberg, i. 396. Perhaps, as Pagi (xii. 621) and others say, Boniface regarded himself as bishop of Utrecht, and Eoban as his coadjutor.

[o] Willib. 11; Pagi, 626.

[p] Willibald, 11.

[q] Life of Gregory, in Mabillon, iv. 320 seqq. He is sometimes wrongly styled a bishop. Mabill. iii. Præf. See also Rettberg, ii. 531-3; Neander's Memorials, 470-3.

[r] Rettberg, ii. 537-540.

[s] Willib. 12, seqq.; Rettberg, i. 401.

fitted to act in the conversion of the German nations, and to impress its converts with a Roman character.[t] And this was especially the work of Boniface. He went forth to his labours with the pope's commission. On his consecration to the episcopate, after his first successes, he bound himself by oath to reduce all whom he might influence to the obedience of St. Peter and his representatives. The increased powers and the wider jurisdiction bestowed on him by later popes were employed to the same end. He laboured continually, not only to bring heathens into the Church, but to check irregular missionary operations, and to subject both preachers and converts to the authority of Rome. Through his agency the alliance naturally prompted by the mutual interest of the papacy and the Frankish princes was effected. And, whether he shared or not in the final step by which the papal sanction was used to consecrate the transference of the crown to the descendants of Charles Martel, his exertions had undoubtedly paved the way for it. To him belongs in no small measure the authorship of that connexion with the northern rulers which encouraged the popes to disown the sovereignty of Constantinople; and, on the other hand, to him is to be traced the character of the German Church in its submission to Rome from the time of the first council held under Carloman in 742.[u]

But these facts afford no warrant for the charges brought against Boniface by writers of the last century.[x] One who, after having passed his seventieth year, resigned the primacy of the Frankish church to set out as a simple missionary to the barbarous Frisians, with an expectation (as it would seem) of the violent death which he met, may safely be acquitted not only of personal ambition, but of having been "a missionary of the papacy rather than of Christianity."[y] His labours for the papacy were really performed, because, trained as he had been under the influences communicated to his native church by Theodore and Wilfrid, he believed the authority of Rome to be the true means of spreading Christianity among the heathen, and of reviving it from decay in countries where it was already established. It may have been that in his zeal for unity he made too little allowance for the peculiar tempers and positions of men, or may

[t] Guizot, ii. 173; Michelet, ii. 16.

[u] Giesceler, II. i. 23.

[x] Such as Mosheim (ii. 119) and Schröckh. Rettberg (i. 310) mentions J. E. C. Schmidt's Church-History as carrying the depreciation to an extreme.

[y] Thus Schröckh describes him, xix. 242.

sometimes have been guilty of injustice towards his opponents; nor can it be pretended that his opinions were in advance of the century in which he lived, whereas ingenious conjecture may ascribe to the sectaries Adelbert and Clement all the spiritual enlightenment of modern Heidelberg or Berlin. But let it be considered how little such men, however highly they may be estimated, could have effected; how powerless such teaching, the offspring of their personal discoveries or fancies, must have been for the great work of suppressing heathenism; how distracting to the heathen must have been the spectacle of rival and discordant types of Christianity; how necessary the operation of one uniform and organised system must have reasonably appeared to Boniface, whether for the extension of the Gospel or for the reform of the Church, for an effective opposition to the rudeness, the violence, the lawless passions with which he had on all sides to contend. That Boniface ever used force as an instrument of conversion there is no evidence whatever; his earnestness in the promotion of education proves how thoroughly he desired that understanding should accompany the profession of belief. And that the knowledge which he wished to spread by his educational institutions was to be drawn from the Scriptures, of which he was himself a diligent student, appears from the eagerness with which he endeavoured to obtain as many copies as possible of the sacred books for the instruction of his converts. His letters and other writings give us the impression, not only of a great missionary, but of a man abounding in human feelings and affections.[z]

Strenuous as Boniface was in the cause of the papacy, his conception of it was far short of that which afterwards prevailed. He regarded the pope as the supreme ecclesiastical judge, the chief conservator of the canons, the highest member of a graduated hierarchy, superior to metropolitans, as metropolitans were to ordinary bishops, but yet not as belonging to a different order from other bishops, or as if their episcopacy were derived from him and were a function of his.[a] Much has been said of the strange questions on which he sometimes requests the pope's advice —as to the lawfulness of eating horseflesh, magpies, and storks; as to the time when bacon may be eaten without cooking, and the like.[b] Such questions have been regarded as proofs of miserable scrupulousness in themselves, and the reference of them to Rome has been branded as disgraceful servility. But—(besides that we

[z] Ozanam, 210-1. [a] Rettberg, i. 411. [b] Ep. 25, 76 (pp. 183-5).

are not in a condition to judge of the matter without a fuller knowledge of the circumstances)—it is easy to discover some grounds of justification against these charges. Thus, the horse was a favourite victim of the gods among the northern nations, so that the eating of horseflesh was connected with the practice of heathen sacrifice.[c] And the real explanation of such questions would seem to be, not that Boniface felt himself unable to answer them, or wished for any direction from the pope, but that he was desirous to fortify himself with the aid of the highest authority in the Church for his struggle against those remnants of barbaric manners which tended to keep up among his converts the remembrance of their ancient idolatry.[d]

If Boniface's zeal for Rome was strong, his concern for religion and morality was yet stronger.[e] He remonstrated very boldly against some regulations as to marriage which were said to have the authority of Rome, but which to him appeared immoral; he denied that any power on earth could legalise them.[f] He remonstrated also against the Roman view which regarded "spiritual affinity"—*i. e.* the connexions formed by sponsorship at baptism—as a bar to marriage.[g] He strongly represented to Zacharias the scandal of the heathenish rejoicings and banqueting which were allowed at Rome at the beginning of the year, and the manner in which persons who had visited Rome referred to these as a warrant for their own disorders.[h] He protested against the simoniacal appearance of the charges exacted for palls—perhaps by the pope's officials without their master's knowledge.[i] As a counterpoise to all that is said of Boniface's deference to the popes, we must in fairness observe (although his assailants have not adverted to it) the tone of high consideration in which Zacharias answers,[k] and the earnestness with which he endeavours to vindicate himself from the suspicion of countenancing abuses—a remarkable testimony to the estimation in which the Apostle of Germany was held. And, if an anonymous biographer may be believed, Boniface, towards the end of his life, protested against Stephen II. for

[c] Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie, i. 41-3; Ozanam, 189. In England, Egbert's Penitential allowed horseflesh to be eaten, "licet multæ familiæ eam emere nolint" (c. 38, ap. Wilkins, i. 123). But the papal legates at Chalcythe, in 785, denounced the eating of it as not practised by any "Orientals" (c. 19)—i. e. nations to the east of *England*. See hereafter the accounts of the conversion of Norway and Iceland, Book II. c. vii. sections 12-13.

[d] Luden, iv. 470; Rettberg, i. 418.

[e] Gieseler, II. i. 27; Rettberg, i. 412-3.

[f] Ep. 49.

[g] Epp. 39-40.

[h] Ep. 49, pp. 104-5.

[i] Ep. 55. See De Marca, VI. x. 11.

[k] Epp. 50, 55.

having, during his visit to France, consecrated a bishop of Metz—an act which the archbishop regarded as an invasion of the metropolitical privileges of Treves; and Pipin's mediation was required to heal the difference between the pope and him whom many writers have represented as the abject slave of Rome.[m]

The spirit of unfair disparagement, however, has now past away;[n] and both the church from which Boniface went forth and the nations among which he ministered may well combine to do honour to his memory.

[m] Anon. Mogunt. ap. Pertz, ii. 356; Rettberg, i. 413; Milman, ii. 115. The bishop in question was Chrodegang, as to whom see below, c. VIII. iii. 21.

[n] Even Ellendorf, a writer who, although in communion with Rome, is very violent in his enmity to the hierarchy, vindicates Boniface. 'Die Karolinger und die Hierarchie ihrer Zeit,' i. 87.

CHAPTER VI.

PIPIN AND CHARLEMAGNE.

A.D. 741-814.

THE alienation which the iconoclastic controversy tended to produce between the Byzantine emperors and the bishops of Rome was increased by other circumstances. The nearest and most dreaded neighbours of the popes were the Lombards. The hatred with which the Romans had originally regarded these on account of their Arianism had survived their conversion to orthodox Christianity, and had been exasperated by political hostility. In the iconoclastic troubles, the Lombards, under Liutprand, appear by turns to have threatened the popes and to have affected to extend alliance and protection to them, with a view of using them as instruments for weakening the imperial influence in Italy.[a] When that influence seemed to be irreparably injured by the course which events had taken, the Lombards overran the exarchate, and advanced to the walls of the pope's own city. Gregory III., after a vain attempt to obtain aid from Constantinople, resolved to call in new allies from beyond the Alps—the nation of the Franks, who had been catholic from the beginning of their Christianity, with whom he had lately formed a closer connexion by means of Boniface, and whose virtual sovereign, Charles Martel, was marked out by his triumph over the Mahometan invaders of his country as the leader and protector of Western Christendom.[b] As it was natural to suppose that the Frankish mayor would prefer the prosecution of his victories on the side of Spain to engaging himself in new quarrels elsewhere, the pope strengthened his petition for aid by the most persuasive gifts and proposals; he sent to Charles the keys of St. Peter's tomb, with some filings of the Apostle's chains; it is said that he offered him the title of consul or patrician[c] of Rome, and even that he offered to transfer

A.D. 739.

[a] Schröckh, xix. 532-4. See above, p. 87.

[b] Milman, ii. 215.

[c] The title of patrician, in the later days of the empire, designated the dignity next to the throne, and might be held with several high offices (De Marca, I. xii. 4; Gieseler, II. i. 38). According to one reading of the continuator of Fredegar (in Baron. 740. 20), Gregory offered the kingdom (*regnum*) to Charles, but the more correct reading is *rogum* or *rogum* – i. e. petition. Schröckh, xix. 538-541.

the allegiance of the Romans from the empire to the Frankish crown.[d] A second application followed soon after. The pope's tone in this is extremely piteous; he speaks as if the Lombards had even entered Rome and plundered the church of St. Peter; he endeavours to excite Charles against them by motives of jealousy as well as of piety.[e] It would seem that this application was favourably received; but it produced no result, as the death of both Gregory and Charles followed within the same year.[f]

A.D. 741.

The next pope, Zacharias, a Greek by birth, was chosen without the confirmation either of the emperor or of the exarch—the first instance, it is said, of such an omission since the reign of Odoacer.[g] By repeated personal applications to Liutprand, he obtained the forbearance of the Lombards and recovered some towns which they had seized.[h] His relations with the empire are obscure; the state of affairs was indeed so unsettled that these relations were full of anomaly and inconsistency. But under his pontificate took place an event which produced an important change in the position of the papacy towards the Franks, and consequently in its position towards the empire. Pipin, whose accession, first, to a portion of his father's power, and afterwards to the remainder, on the resignation of his brother, has already been mentioned,[i] now thought that the time was come for putting an end to the pageant royalty of the Merovingians. Two confidential ecclesiastics, Burkhard, bishop of Würzburg, and Fulrad, archchaplain of the court, were sent to Rome with instructions to ask, in the name of the Frankish nation, whether the real holders of power or the nominal sovereigns ought rather to reign.[k] The answer of Zacharias was favourable to the wishes of those who proposed the question; and at the national assembly of Soissons, in the year 752,[m] Pipin was raised aloft on a buckler, amid the acclamations of his people, and was crowned king of the Franks, while the last Merovingian, Childeric III., was tonsured and shut up in a monastery.

A.D. 751-2.

[d] See Pagi, xii. 453-5; Martin, ii. 291.

[e] Milman, ii. 216-7. Muratori (Annali, x. 215; ed. 1827) questions, and, as Dean Milman thinks, with reason, the interpretation of Gregory's words, which represents Rome as taken.

[f] Schröckh, xix. 538-9.

[g] See vol. i. p. 499. Schröckh, xix. 539, thinks the statement as to Zacharias wanting in proof. At all events he was a subject of the empire, which some have denied.

[h] Anastas. 162-3.

[i] Pp. 101, 106.

[k] Einhard, Annal. A.D. 750; Pagi, xii. 563.

[m] March 1, according to Pagi, xii. 570-3; but Mansi (ibid.) thinks that it was after July 2.

The amount of the pope's share in this revolution, and the morality of his proceedings, have been the subjects of much controversy. Charlemagne's biographer, Einhard, in the earlier part of the following century, speaks of the deposition as effected by the *command* (*jussu*), and of the coronation as performed by the *authority* (*auctoritate*), of the Roman pontiff;[n] but (besides that this writer may have misapprehended the real course of the affair) a comparison of other passages will show that the meaning of his words is less strong than might at first sight appear, and is reconcilable with the facts which are otherwise ascertained. The matter really came before Zacharias in the form of a question from the Frankish estates; his answer was an opinion, not a command; and the sovereignty was bestowed on Pipin, not by the pope, but by the choice of his own countrymen. The view maintained by Gregory VII. and his school[o]—that the pope in this case exercised a right inherent in his office, of deposing sovereigns at will—is altogether foreign to the ideas of the time, and inconsistent with the facts of the case.[p] The pope's opinion was valuable to Pipin, as assisting him to supplant the nominal king, and yet throwing over the change an appearance of religious sanction which might guard it from becoming a precedent for future breaches of fealty towards his own dynasty.[q]

It is evident that the pope's answer was prompted rather by a consideration for his own interest in securing the alliance of Pipin than by any regard for strict moral or religious principle. Yet we should do Zacharias injustice by visiting it with all the reprobation which modern ideas of settled and legitimate inheritance might suggest. The question proposed to him was one which must have seemed very plausible in times when might went far to constitute right, and when revolutions were familiar in every state. The Frankish monarchy had been elective at first, and had never been

[n] Vit. Carol. 1-3.

[o] Greg. VII. Epp. iv. 2; viii. 21 (Hard. vi. 1345, 1471).

[p] "It is impossible," says Mr. Hallam, "to consider the reference as to the deposition of Childeric in any other light than as a point of casuistry laid before the first religious judge in the church. Certainly the Franks, who raised the king of their choice upon their shields, never dreamed that a foreign priest had conferred upon him the right of governing. Yet it was easy for succeeding advocates of Rome to construe this transaction very favourably for its usurpation over the thrones of the earth" (Middle Ages, i. 523). See Nat. Alexand. xi. 175, seqq.; Schröckh, xix. 551; Schmidt, i. 300, 378; Planck, ii. 731; Gieseler, II. i. 37. Luden thinks that Pipin was urged on by Boniface or by the Pope, in the expectation that the church would be the chief gainer by the change of dynasty (iv. 181). But this seems inconsistent with such facts as are known; and, as we have seen (p. 107), Boniface was, perhaps, even opposed to the change.

[q] Gieseler, II. i. 35. See Neander, v. 165.

bound down to the rule of strictly hereditary succession.[r] It was held that any member of the royal house might be chosen king; thus, Clotaire IV. had been set up by Charles Martel in 717,[s] and Childeric III. himself was a Merovingian of unknown parentage, whom Pipin and Carloman had established, for purposes of their own, in 742, after the nominal sovereignty had been five years vacant.[t] It was also held that kings might be set aside on the ground of incapacity. The only principle, therefore, which was violated in the transference of the crown was that which limited the choice of a sovereign to the Merovingian family; and, in order to cover this irregularity in the eyes of the Franks, it is said to have been pretended that Pipin was himself a Merovingian.[u] By whatever means the change of dynasty may have been vindicated or disguised, it does not appear to have shocked the general moral feeling of the age; and this, although it will not suffice to justify Zacharias, must be allowed in some measure to excuse him.

Zacharias died in March, 752, a little before or after the consummation of the change which he had sanctioned. Stephen, who was chosen in his room, did not live to be consecrated, and is therefore by most writers not reckoned in the list of the popes, so that his successor, another Stephen, is sometimes styled the second, and sometimes the third,[x] of that name. Aistulf was now king of the Lombards, and renewed the aggressions of his predecessors on Rome.[y] Stephen, by means of splendid presents, obtained from him a promise of peace for forty years, but the treaty was almost immediately broken. Aistulf seized Ravenna, and required the Romans to own him as their lord. The pope then sent envoys to beg for aid from the emperor, and in the meantime he affixed the violated treaty to the cross, and occupied himself in imploring the help of God by solemn prayers and penitential processions. The mission to Constantinople proved fruitless, and Stephen, relying on the success of his predecessor Zacharias in similar attempts, repaired to Pavia, in the hope of moving Aistulf by personal entreaties; but, although he met with respectful treatment, he was unable to obtain any promise of forbearance.[z] His only remaining hope was in Pipin, with whom he

[r] Einhard, Vit. Car. I.
[s] Pagi, xii. 277.
[t] Pagi, xii. 488-9; Sismondi, ii. 129.
[u] Lehuërou, ii. 98–111, 326.
[x] Anastas. 165; Pagi, xii. 578; Schröckh, xix. 553. Stephen I. was the contemporary of St. Cyprian.
[y] Ellendorf, in his hatred of popes, takes up the cause of the Lombards, whom he supposes to have been zealous friends of the church, although enemies to its temporal power and wealth (i. 101-2). He denies that Aistulf threatened Rome, p. 111.
[z] Vit. Chrodegangi, c. 24 (Pertz, x.); Pagi, xii. 580; Schröckh, xix. 553-7.

had opened a secret negotiation. He therefore resolved to proceed into France, and, as Aistulf endeavoured to dissuade him, the fear lest the Lombard should detain him by force added speed to his journey across the Alps. On hearing of the pope's approach, Pipin sent his son Charles to act as escort, and he himself, with his queen, the younger princes, and the nobles of his court, went forth a league from the palace of Pontyon-le-Perche to meet him. Stephen and his clergy appeared in sackcloth and ashes, and, throwing themselves at the king's feet, humbly implored his assistance against the Lombards. Pipin received the suppliants with marks of extraordinary honour; he prostrated himself in turn before the pope, and walked by his side as he rode.[a] A second coronation was performed at St. Denys July 28, by the pope's own hands; and, in the hope of securing 754. the new dynasty against a repetition of the movements by which its own royalty had been won, the Frankish nation was charged, under pain of interdict and excommunication, never to choose any other king than a descendant of Charles Martel. Pipin was also invested with the dignity of patrician of Rome.[b]

The pope's stay in France was prolonged by illness, which compelled him to spend the winter at St. Denys. During this time an unexpected opponent of his suit appeared in the person of Carloman, who, at the instigation of Aistulf, had been compelled by the abbot of Monte Cassino to go into France for the purpose of urging his brother to refuse the aid which Stephen had requested. But Stephen exerted his pontifical authority over the monk, and Carloman was shut up in a monastery at Vienne, where he died soon after.[c]

In the following year, Pipin, although some of the Frankish chiefs opposed the expedition, and even threatened to desert him,[d] led an army into Italy, and compelled Aistulf to swear that he would restore to St. Peter the towns which he had seized. But no sooner had the northern forces recrossed the Alps than Aistulf refused to fulfil his engagements, invaded the Roman territory, wasted the country up to the very walls of Rome, and laid siege to the city.[e] As the way by land was blocked up, the pope sent off by sea a letter entreating his Frankish ally once more to assist

[a] The French writers relate the behaviour of Stephen, the Italians that of Pipin. I have combined the accounts, as they are not irreconcilable. See Schröckh, xix. 557; Milman, ii. 240.

[b] Anastas. 167-8; Einhard, Annal. 753; Fleury, xliii. 14; Sismondi, ii. 187; Milman, ii. 239-241.

[c] Anastas. 169.

[d] Einhard, Vit. Car. 6.

[e] Anastas. 170; Baron. 755. 1, seqq.

him.[f] Another and a more urgent letter followed; and finally the pope wrote a third, in the name of St. Peter himself—an expedient which may perhaps have been suggested or encouraged by the impression as to the character of the Franks which he had derived from his late sojourn among them.[g] In this strange document the apostle is made to join the authority of the Blessed Virgin with his own; supplication, threats, flattery are mingled, and, in consideration of the aid which is asked for the defence of the papal temporalities, assurances are given not only of long life and victory, but of salvation and heavenly glory—apparently without any reserve or condition of a moral kind.[h] Pipin again invaded Italy. Aistulf yielded, and the pope received a gift of cities and territory which for the first time gave him the position of a temporal prince.[i] Some Byzantine envoys, who were present at the conclusion of the treaty, urged that the exarchate should be restored to their master, to whom it had belonged before it was seized by the Lombards; but Pipin replied that he had conquered for St. Peter, and could not dispose otherwise of that which he had offered to the apostle.[k] Yet it does not appear that the gift was one of independent sovereignty; the territories bestowed on the pope were held under the Frankish crown,[m] and, on the other side, the anomalies of the relation between the popes and the empire became now more complex than ever. While Pipin was patrician of Rome by the pope's grant—while the pope received from the Frankish king lands which the emperor claimed as his own—while Rome continued to be virtually separated from the empire by the consequences of the iconoclastic controversy—the popes were still regarded as subjects of the emperors, and dated by the years of their reign.[n]

In 757 Stephen II. died, and was succeeded by his own brother,

[f] The letters of popes to Pipin and Charlemagne are given by Bouquet, v. 485, seqq.

[g] Milman, ii. 244.

[h] Bouquet, v. 495-7. Fleury calls this "un artifice sans exemple devant ni après dans toute l'histoire de l'Eglise," and remarks, "L'Eglise y signifie, non l'assemblée des fidèles, mais les biens temporels consacrés à Dieu; le troupeau de Jésus-Christ sont les corps, et non pas les âmes; les promesses temporelles de l'ancienne loi sont mêlées avec les spirituelles de l'Evangile, et les motifs les plus saints de la religion employés pour une affaire d'état" (xliii. 17; Cf. Discours, ii. 3). These observations raise the wrath of Rohrbacher, xi. 115. M. Ozanam (231) defends the letter—or rather considers it to be above the need of defence—because it was the custom of the time to substitute in charters, &c., the name of a founder or of a patron saint for that of his church. But this is obviously no parallel to a letter in which St. Peter is represented as saying, not that he writes by Stephen, but that Stephen and the Roman church write through him.

[i] Anast. 171; Gibbon, iv. 488-490; Schröckh, xix. 565-7.

[k] Anastas. 123.

[m] See Planck, ii. 743, 752-5; Guizot, ii. 335; Luden, v. 215, and note.

[n] Schröckh, xix. 567-571, 576; Milman, ii. 248-9.

Paul, who held the pontificate ten years.[o] While Paul was on his deathbed, Toto, duke of Nepi, made his way into Rome, at the head of an armed multitude, forced some bishops hastily to ordain his brother, Constantine, through all the grades of the ministry, and put him in possession of the papal chair.[p] The intruder had held it for thirteen months, when he was ejected by an opposite party, and Stephen III. (or IV.) was established in his stead. Constantine's partisans were subjected to the barbarous punishments usual in that age—the loss of the eyes or of the tongue; he himself, after having been thrust into a monastery by one faction of his enemies, was dragged out of it by another, was blinded, and in that condition was left in the public street.[q] A council was held under the sanction of Charles and Carloman, who had just succeeded their father Pipin in the sovereignty of the Franks and in the patriciate of Rome. Constantine was brought before this assembly, and was asked why he had presumed, being a layman, to invade the apostolic see. He declared that he had been forced into the office against his will; he threw himself on the floor, stretched out his hands, and, with a profusion of tears, entreated forgiveness for his misdeeds. On the following day he was again brought before the council, and was strictly questioned about the "impious novelty" of his proceedings. He ventured to answer that it was not a novelty, and named the archbishops of Ravenna and Naples as having been advanced at once from a lay condition to the episcopate. At this reply the members of the council started from their seats in fury. They fell on the blind man, beat him violently, and thrust him out of the church in which their sessions were held. They then proceeded to annul the ordinations and other official acts which he had performed as pope, burned the records of his pontificate, and denounced anathemas against any one who should aspire to the papacy without having regularly passed through the grade of cardinal priest, or deacon. Stephen himself, with all the clergy and a multitude of the Roman laity, prostrated themselves, and with tears professed contrition for having received the eucharist at the usurper's hands; and a suitable penance was imposed on them.[r]

A.D. 767.

A.D. 768.

It was the interest of the popes to prevent the formation of any connexion between their Frankish allies and the hated Lombards. Stephen, therefore, was beyond measure disquieted when intelligence reached him, in 770, that Desiderius, the successor of

[o] Anastas. 172.
[p] Anastas. 174.
[q] Id. 176.
[r] Anast. 176-7.

Aistulf, had projected the union of his family with that of Pipin by a double tie - that he had offered his daughter in marriage to either Charles or Carloman, and that their sister was engaged to Adelgis, son of the Lombard king. The pope forthwith addressed an extraordinary letter of remonstrance to the Frankish princes.[s] As they were both already married, he tells them that it would be sin to divorce their wives for the sake of any new alliance. But moral or religious objections hold a very subordinate place in the remonstrance, while the pope exhausts himself in heaping up expressions of detestation against the Lombards, and in protesting against the pollution of the royal Frankish blood by any admixture with that "perfidious and most unsavoury" race—since from such a marriage no other than a leprous offspring could be expected.[t] The letter concludes with denunciations of eternal fire, and the pope states that, in order to give it all possible solemnity, it was laid on St. Peter's tomb, and the eucharistic sacrifice was offered on it. Charles, unmoved by this appeal, repudiated his wife and espoused the Lombard princess; but within a year—for what reason is unknown,[u] but certainly not out of any regard to Stephen's wishes—she was sent back to her father's court, and another queen, Hildegard, took her place.

A.D. 771.

In his relations with Stephen, Desiderius was studious to maintain a specious appearance of friendship, while he resisted or eluded all applications for the restoration of what were styled "the rights of St. Peter."[x] On the election of Adrian as Stephen's successor (A.D. 772), the Lombard king made overtures to him, and promised to satisfy all his demands, if the pope would visit him at Pavia; but the invitation was refused. Desiderius avenged himself by ravaging the borders of the papal territory, and Adrian invoked the aid of Charles.[y] Carloman had died in 771, and Charles, without any regard to the rights of his brother's family, had united the whole of the Frankish dominions under his own rule. Desiderius, stimulated perhaps rather by his own daughter's

[s] Ap. Bouquet, v. 540, seqq.

[t] "Ne splendidlua ac nobilissima regalis vestræ potentiæ proles perfida (quod absit!) ac *fœtentissimæ* Langobardorum gente polluatur, quæ in numero gentium nequaquam computatur, de cujus natione et leprosorum genus oriri certum est" (542). The last words are sometimes interpreted as meaning that the Lombards had introduced the leprosy into the world, or, at least, into Italy. (See Manzoni, Discorso Storico, Opere, i. p. 248; Par. 1843.) But the sense given in the text appears to agree best with the tenor of the letter.

[u] See Baron. 771. 3; Manzoni, i. p. 237; Schröckh, xix. 583-4; Luden, iv. 260-3, 513.

[x] Under the name of "justitiæ S. Petri" were comprehended all sorts of things which could be claimed as belonging to the church. Manzoni, Opere, i. 238-9. See Milman, ii. 252.

[y] Anastas. 180, seqq.; Milman, ii. 258-9.

wrongs than by a disinterested regard for justice, had espoused the cause of the disinherited princes, and had requested the pope to crown them; but Adrian, from unwillingness to embroil himself with Charles, and consequently to place himself at the mercy of the Lombards, had refused.[z] Charles now readily listened to the petition of his ally. He asked Desiderius to give up the disputed territory, and even offered him a large sum of money as compensation, while the pope sent repeated embassies to the Lombard king, and at last proposed to pay him the desired visit, on condition that Desiderius should first perform his part of the agreement by restoring the rights of St. Peter. Desiderius, supposing that Charles must be fully occupied by his war with the Saxons, attempted to satisfy him with evasive answers, and even assured him that the papal territory had already been restored; but his representations had no effect on Charles, who, in 773, invaded Italy, besieged him in Pavia, and overthrew the Lombard dominion.[a] Desiderius was compelled to become a monk at Liege.[b] His son Adelgis escaped to Constantinople, where, although the honour of the patriciate was conferred on him, Charles was able to prevent him from obtaining any effective aid for the recovery of his inheritance.[c] Twelve years later, by a convention with the Lombard duke of Beneventó, Charles became lord of the remaining part of Italy,[d] and in 788 Adelgis was killed in an unsuccessful invasion of the Neapolitan territory.[e]

A.D. 773-4.

A.D. 786.

During the siege of Pavia, in 774, Charles paid his first visit to Rome, where he arrived on Easter-eve. The magistrates were sent by the pope to meet him at the distance of thirty miles from the city. A mile outside the walls, the soldiery appeared, with all the children of the schools, who bore branches of palm and olive, and hailed him with hymns of welcome. The sacred crosses were carried forth as for the reception of an exarch, and Charles, at the sight of them, dismounted, and proceeded on foot towards St. Peter's Church, where the pope and all his clergy were in waiting. The king kissed each step of the staircase, and, on reaching the landing-place, he kissed the pope, and entered the building holding his right hand. He kept the festival season

[z] Einhard, Vit. Car. 3-6; Anastas. 181.

[a] Anastas. 183-5; Einhard, Annal. 773; Vit. Car. 7. Although I quote these works together, it ought to be mentioned that the annalist is now supposed not to be identical with the biographer.

[b] Pagi, xiii. 101.

[c] Einhard, Annal. 774; Schlosser, 252.

[d] Einhard, Vit. Car. 10; Annal. 786.

[e] Pagi, xiii. 232.

with a great appearance of devotion; he enlarged the donation which Pipin had made to the Church, confirmed it by an oath, and solemnly laid the deed of gift on the Apostle's tomb.[f] The actual extent of his donation is, however, uncertain. It is said to have included not only the exarchate of Ravenna, but the dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, Venetia, Istria, and other territories in the north of Italy—in short, almost the whole peninsula —with the island of Corsica.[g] It would appear that Charles, in his gratitude for the opportunity of interfering in the affairs of Italy, professed to bestow on the pope spoils which had not at the time been fully won, and that he was afterwards indisposed to carry his promises into effect. The papal rule seems to have been really limited to the exarchate, and this was held not in absolute sovereignty, but in dependence on the Frankish monarchs.[h] Charles visited Rome again in 781, and a third time in 787, and on each occasion the Church was enriched by gifts, bestowed, as he professed in the language of the age, "for the good of his soul."[i] His connexion with Adrian was cemented not only by interest, but by personal regard, and on hearing of the pope's death, he is said to have wept for him as for a brother.[k]

In 795, Adrian was succeeded by Leo III. The political condition of Rome for many years before this time is very obscure. According to some writers,[m] it had been a republic, under the popes, from the date of Pipin's donation (A.D. 755); but against this view it has been urged that the letter of Adrian to the emperor Constantine and his mother, on occasion of the second council of Nicæa, proves that even so late as 785 the imperial sovereignty continued to be in some degree acknowledged.[n] But, although the Byzantine rulers were now in agreement with Rome on the question of images, the older differences as to that question had produced a lasting estrangement; so that Leo, in announcing his election to Charlemagne, sent him the banner of Rome with the keys of St. Peter's tomb, and begged him to send commissioners for the purpose of administering to the citizens an oath of allegiance to the Frankish crown.[o] Whether we regard this as an illustration of the relations which already existed between Rome and the Franks, or as a voluntary act, by which the pope, for the sake of gaining a powerful protector, placed himself and his people in a

[f] Anastas. 185-6; Schröckh, xix. 588; Gibbon, iv. 487.
[g] Anastas. 186.
[h] See Schröckh, xix. 588-592; Gibbon, ix. 489; Milman, ii. 261-2.
[i] Schröckh, xix. 592.
[k] Einhard, Vit. Car. 19.
[m] As Pagi, xiii. 320.
[n] Gieseler, II. i. 41.
[o] Einhard, Annal. 796.

new relation of dependence—it proves that the connexion with the eastern empire was severed, and that, if Rome had been independent, it was no longer so.[p]

The promotion of Leo deeply offended some relations of Adrian who had occupied high positions in the papal government. They waited upwards of three years for an opportunity of gratifying their enmity; and at length, as the pope was conducting a procession through the streets of Rome, a party of his enemies rushed forth, dispersed his unarmed companions, threw him from his horse, and attempted to deprive him of his eyes and of his tongue. Whether from haste or from pity,[q] they did their work imperfectly; but Paschal and Campulus, two of Adrian's nephews, dragged the pope into the church of a neighbouring monastery, threw him down before the altar, attempted to complete the operations which had been begun, beat him cruelly with sticks, and left him weltering in his blood. Notwithstanding all these outrages, Leo retained his sight and his speech; it was popularly believed that he had recovered them through the help of St. Peter.[r] Through the aid of his friends, he was enabled to escape, and, under the escort of the duke of Spoleto, a vassal of the Frankish king, he reached that city. On receiving a report of his sufferings, Charles, who was detained in the north by the Saxon war, invited him to Paderborn, where he was received with great honour.[s] April 25, 799.

About the same time some envoys from Rome appeared at Paderborn, with serious charges against Leo. Charles promised to investigate these at Rome; and, after having sent back the pope with a convoy of two archbishops, five bishops, and five counts, who re-established him in his see, the king himself proceeded by slow and indirect journeys towards the city, where he arrived in the end of November, 800.[t] The inquiry into Leo's case was opened before an assembly of archbishops, bishops, abbots, and nobles; but no testimony was produced against the pope, and the prelates and clergy who were present declined the office of judging, on the ground of an opinion which had gradually grown up, that the successor of St. Peter was not amen- Nov. 29, 799. Dec. 1, 800.

[p] See Schröckh, xix. 600; Ellendorf, i. 195.

[q] Theophan. 732; Schröckh, xix. 602-3.

[r] Anastas. 197-8. The monk of St. Gall (i. 28) assures us that both for use and for appearance the new eyes were far better than the old.

[s] Einhard, Annal. 799; Poëta Saxo, 255; Anastas. 198.

[t] Einhard, Annal. 800; Schröckh, xix. 603-4.

able to any human (or rather, perhaps, to any ecclesiastical) judgment.[u] On this Leo declared himself ready to clear his innocence by an oath; and on a later day, he ascended the pulpit, and solemnly swore on the Gospels that he had neither committed nor caused to be committed the offences which were laid to his charge.[x] The conspirators who had been concerned in the assault on him were soon after tried, and, as they could make no defence, were condemned to death; but at the pope's request the sentence was commuted to banishment.[y]

Dec. 23, 800.

But between the purgation of Leo and the trial of his assailants an important event had taken place. On Christmas-day—the first day of the ninth century, according to the reckoning then observed in the west[z]—Charles attended mass in St. Peter's, when, as he was kneeling before the altar, the pope suddenly placed a splendid crown on his head, and the vast congregation burst forth into acclamations of "Life and victory to Charles, crowned by God emperor of Rome!"[a] Leo then proceeded to anoint Charles and his son Pipin, King of Italy, and led the way in doing homage to the new emperor.[b] In conversation with his attendants, Charles professed great surprise, and even displeasure, at the coronation, declaring that, if he had expected such a scene, not even the holiness of the Christmas festival should have induced him to go into the church on that day.[c] There can, however, be little question that his elevation to the imperial dignity had been before arranged. Perhaps the idea had been suggested to him by a letter in which his confidential friend Alcuin spoke of the popedom, the empire, and the sovereignty of the Franks as the three highest dignities in the world, and pointed out how unworthily the imperial throne, the

[u] Anastas. 199. For the history of this opinion, see Gieseler, I. ii. 403-4, and II. i. 43.

[x] Anastas. 199. The nature of these charges is unknown. Alcuin (Ep. 92) mentions the intrigues of some persons who attempted to get the pope deposed for adultery or perjury. He treats the matter very tenderly, as if he believed Leo to be guilty, yet wished to uphold the credit of the Roman See. (Lorenz, Life of Alcuin, 199-201.) The words of Leo's purgation, "nec perpetravi *nec perpetrari jussi*" (Pertz, Leges, ii. 15), seem inconsistent with the idea that unchastity was the sin imputed to him. Dean Milman (ii. 169) therefore thinks that he was charged with *spiritual* adultery—i. e. simony—a sin of which Alcuin writes, in 803, that it prevailed *almost* up to the apostolic chair. Ep. 116. Yet the *jussi* need not relate to *all* the charges.

[y] Einhard, Annal. 801.

[z] Teulet, n. in Einhard, i. 249.

[a] "Carolo piissimo Augusto a Deo coronato, magno, pacifico imperatori, vita et victoria." (Anast. 199.) The metrical biographer thus paraphrases the cry—

"Augusto Carolo magno, pacemque ferenti,
Imperii merito Romani sceptra tenenti,
Gloria, prosperitas, regnum, pax, vita, triumphus!"—*Poëta Saxo*, 259.

[b] Anastas. 199.

[c] Einhard, Vit. Car. 28.

higher of the two secular monarchies, was then filled.[d] On his way to Rome, the king had visited Alcuin at Tours, and he now received from him as a Christmas-gift a Bible corrected by the learned abbot's own hand, with a letter in which the present was said to be intended in honour of the imperial dignity.[e] It may therefore be conjectured that the assumption of the empire had been settled between Charles and Leo during the pope's residence at Paderborn, or, at least, that Leo had there discovered the king's inclination, and that Alcuin had been for some time in the secret.[f]

Yet we need not tax Charles with insincerity in his expressions of dissatisfaction after the coronation; and his general character, of which dissimulation was no part, rather leads to the supposition that, while he had desired the imperial title, he was displeased at the manner in which it had been conferred. He may have regarded the pope's act as premature, as an interference with his own plans. He may have seen that it was capable of such an interpretation as was afterwards actually put upon it—as if the pope were able to bestow the empire by his own authority—a pretension altogether inconsistent with the whole spirit of Charlemagne's policy.[g] Perhaps it had been the king's intention to procure his election by the Romans, and afterwards to be crowned by the pope, as the Greek emperors were crowned by the patriarch of Constantinople, after having been elected by the representatives of their subjects; whereas he had now been surprised into receiving the empire from the pope, when the acclamations of the Romans did not precede but followed on the act of Leo.[h] Although, however, the pope's act was capable of an interpretation agreeable to the claims of his successors in later times, such claims appear to have been unknown in the age of Charlemagne; the pope, after having placed the crown on his brow, was the first to do homage to him as a subject of the empire.[i]

By the coronation of Charles, Rome was finally severed from the Greek empire, and again became the acknowledged capital of the West. Charlemagne was invested with the double character

[d] Ep. 80; Rettberg, i. 430. Luden thinks that the idea of the empire arose in the mind of Charles as the case of Leo pressed Italian affairs on his attention. iv. 405, seqq.

[e] Alc. Ep. 103; Lorenz, 278-9.

[f] Schröckh, xix. 24; Rettberg, i. 431; Milman, ii. 270; Mounier, Vie d'Alcuin, 225-6.

[g] Luden, iv. 420-4.

[h] Funck, "Ludwig der Fromme," 243; Ellendorf, i. 198-9. Ozanam suggests that Charles was averse from sinking his German nationality in the traditions of Rome (362), and that he did not for some time accommodate himself to the change. But the Capitul. Aquisgr. of 802, which M. Ozanam quotes, seems to be against this.

[i] Giannone, ii. 29-34; Schröckh, xix. 605; Neander, v. 165; Milman, ii. 271-2.

of head of Western Christendom and representative of the ancient civilisation.[k] The Byzantine court was naturally offended by a step which appeared to invade its rights, both of dignity and of sovereignty; but Charles, by a conciliatory policy, overcame the irritation; his imperial title was recognised by the ambassadors of Nicephorus in 812, and the Greek emperors addressed his son as emperor, although not of Rome, but of the Franks.[m]

The reign of Charles the Great,[n] or Charlemagne, from the time of his father's death, extended to nearly half a century. His fame rests not only on his achievements as a warrior and as a conqueror, but on his legislation and administration both in civil and in ecclesiastical affairs; on his care for the advancement of learning, of commerce, of agriculture, of architecture, and the other arts of peace; and on the versatility and capacity of a mind which embraced the smallest as well as the greatest details in the vast and various system of which he was the head. His wars, aggressive in their form, were essentially defensive. His purpose was, to consolidate the populations which had settled in the territories of the Western empire, and to secure them against the assaults of newer migrations. And this he did effectually on every side, so that from his time no barbaric invasion was attempted, except by sea.[o] Carrying his arms against those from whom he had reason to apprehend an attack, he extended his dominions to the Eider and to the Ebro, over Brittany and Aquitaine, far towards the south of Italy, and eastward to the Theiss and the Save. The impression which he produced on the Greeks is shown by their proverb, "Have the Frank for thy friend, but not for thy neighbour."[p] His influence and authority reached from Scotland to Persia; the great caliph Haroun al Raschid exchanged presents with him, and complimented him by sending him the keys of the holy sepulchre;[q] and, although his vast empire was broken up after his death, the effect of its union remained in the connexion of western Christendom by

A.D. 768-814.

[k] Sismondi, ii. 383; Milman, ii. 271-2.

[m] Einhard. Vit. Car. 28; Schlosser, 281; Martin, ii. 487. The question whether Charlemagne's imperial title was intended to supersede that of the Byzantines—either on the supposition that the empire was *transferred* to him (Chron. Moissiac. ap. Pertz, i. 305; Baron. 800. 9-13), or that he was chosen to fill the place vacated by the dethronement of Constantine, the son of Irene (Palgrave, Normandy and England, i. 29), need not be here discussed. See Mr. Hallam's remarks on such theories. Suppl. Notes, 26-8.

[n] The epithet *Magnus* was not given to him until after his death (Pagi, xiii. 536). M. Michelet asserts that the name *Charlemagne* is not formed from *Carolus Magnus* but from *Carlomata* (ii. 33). But his arguments are ridiculously insufficient.

[o] Guizot, ii. 188-191.

[p] Einhard, 15.

[q] Ibid.

one common bond.[r] The chief stain on the emperor's personal character was a dissoluteness of which the punishment is believed to have been revealed in visions after his death.[s] The seizure of his brother's dominions, to the exclusion of his nephews, is without excuse, and his policy was sometimes stern, even to cruelty. But in general he was mild, open and generous; his family affections were warm, and his friendships were sincere and steady.[t]

The wars of Charlemagne against the barbarians were not religious in their origin, but religion soon became involved in them. His conquests carried the Gospel in their train, and, mistaken as were some of the means at first employed for its propagation, the result was eventually good.[u] Of his fifty-three campaigns, eighteen were against the Saxons of Germany.[x] Between this people and the Franks wars had been waged from time to time for two hundred years. Sometimes the Franks penetrated to the Weser, and imposed a tribute which was irregularly paid; sometimes the Saxons pushed their incursions as far as the Rhine; and on the borders of the territories the more uncivilised of the two nations carried on a constant system of pillage and petty annoyance against their neighbours.[y] The Saxon tribes were divided into three great associations—the Westphalians, the Angarians, and the Ostphalians; they had no king, and were accustomed to choose a leader only in the case of a national war.[z] The valour of the Saxons is admitted even by the Frankish writers; the perfidy which is described as characteristic of them may, in some degree, be explained and palliated by the fact that they were without any central government which could make engagements binding on the whole of the nation.[a]

The war with the Saxons lasted thirty-three years—from 772 to 805. In the first campaign, Charlemagne destroyed the great national idol called the Irminsul, which was erected in a mountainous and woody district near Eresburg (now Stadtberg).[b]

[r] Quart. Rev. xlviii. 423. See too Luden, v. 185-6, and Sir J. Stephen's Third Lecture on Modern History.

[s] Visio S. Wettini, ap. Mabillon, v. 265, seqq.

[t] Einhard, 19.

[u] Rettberg, ii. 374, 394.

[x] See a list of his expeditions in Guizot, ii. 186.

[y] Einhard, Vit. Car. 7; Rettberg, ii. 382.

[z] Poëta Saxo, ap. Pertz, i. 228. See Luden, iv. 277.

[a] Martin, ii. 351; Milman, ii. 284.

[b] Einhard, Car. 772. What the Irminsul was is matter of conjecture. The last syllable, which answers to the modern German *Säule*, may, like that word, denote either a *pillar* or a *statue*. By some writers it is supposed that *Irmin* means the German hero Herman or Arminius, and that the *sul* was a figure of him. (See Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie, 327.) This is the opinion of Luden (iv. 282-4, 520), although he thinks that the Saxons, while they retained the name, had lost the memory of its origin. But it would seem rather

The Saxons retaliated in the following year by attacking the monasteries and churches planted on their frontiers, killing or driving out the monks and clergy, and laying the country waste as far as the Rhine.[c] Sturmi, the successor of Boniface, was obliged to fly from Fulda.[d] The Saxons associated their old idolatry with their nationality, and the Gospel with the interest of the Franks.[e]

A passage in the life of St. Lebuin has been connected with the origin of the Saxon war, but ought probably to be referred to a somewhat later date.[f] Lebuin, an Anglo-Saxon, had preached with much success and had built several churches among the Frisians about the Yssel. An incursion of the neighbouring heathens disturbed him in his labours; whereupon he determined boldly to confront the enemies of the Gospel in all their force. Undeterred by the warnings of his friends, he appeared in his pontifical robes in the national assembly of the Saxons, which was held at Marklo, on the Weser. He spoke to them of the true God, he denounced their idolatry, and told them that, unless they would receive the Gospel and be baptised, God had decreed their ruin by means of a powerful king, not from afar, but from their own neighbourhood, who would sweep them away like a torrent. It was with difficulty that some members of the assembly saved the zealous missionary from their brethren, who were exasperated by this address. They burnt his church at Deventer, and Charlemagne with the Franks, who were met in council at Worms when this outrage was reported, resolved on an expedition against them.[g]

The absence of Charles on expeditions in other quarters, as in Italy or in Spain, was always the signal for a rising of the Saxons. After a time, as we are told by an annalist of his reign,[h] he was provoked by their repeated treacheries to resolve on the con-

that *irmin* is an adjective, meaning *strong*, *powerful* (Rettberg, ii. 385), or *universal* (Grimm, 104); and thus the *Irminsul* is supposed to have been a huge trunk of a tree, placed erect, and regarded by the Saxons as supporting the universe. Adam of Bremen (i. 8) quotes Einhard as saying, that the name means "universalis columna, quasi sustinens omnia." (See the note in Pertz, vii. 285.) Grimm (759) renders it "altissima, universalis columna," and connects the Irminsul with the tree Yggdrasil of Scandinavian mythology. Comp. Schröckh, xix. 256; Turner, i. 222-6; Pfister, i. 417; Pertz, iii. 423 (note on Widukind, i. 12); Milman, ii. 283. Dean Milman appears to me to have somewhat misrepresented Luden's feeling as to the destruction of this monument.

[c] Poëta Saxo, ap. Pertz, i. 230; Rettberg, ii. 375, 404.

[d] Neander, v. 104.

[e] Rettberg, ii. 383.

[f] Rettberg, ii. 406.

[g] Vit. S. Lebuini, ap. Pertz, ii. 362-3. See Luden, iv. 281.

[h] Einhard, A.D. 775.

version or the extermination of the whole race. But in his attempts at conversion, he met with difficulties which it would seem that he had not expected. After every defeat, multitudes of Saxons submitted to baptism without any knowledge or belief of Christian doctrine;[j] but on the first opportunity they revolted, and again professed the religion of their fathers. The long war was carried on with much loss on both sides; on one occasion Charles beheaded 4500 prisoners, who had been given up to him as having shared in the last insurrection.[k] This act, instead of striking the expected terror into the Saxons, excited them to an unusually wide-spread and formidable rising in the following year.[m] A chief named Widikind had thus far been the soul of the Saxon movements. After every reverse, he contrived to escape to Denmark, where he found a refuge with the king, who was his brother-in-law; and when his countrymen were ripe for a renewal of their attempts, he reappeared to act as their leader. But in 785, having secured a promise of impunity, he surrendered himself, together with his brother Abbo, and was baptised at Attigny, where Charles officiated as his sponsor; and—whether an intelligent religious conviction contributed to this result, whether it arose solely from despair of the Saxon cause, or whether his conversion was merely to a belief in that God whose worshippers had been proved the stronger party—his engagements to Charles were faithfully kept.[n] The Saxons were now subdued as far as the Elbe, and many of the fiercer idolaters among them sought an asylum in Scandinavia, where they joined the piratical bands which had already begun their plundering expeditions, and in a few years became the terror of the more civilised nations of Europe.[o] A.D. 782.

A law of extreme severity was now enacted.[p] It denounces the penalty of death against the refusal of baptism; against burning the bodies of the dead, after the manner of the pagans; against eating flesh in Lent, if this be done in contempt of Christianity; against burning churches or violently entering them and stealing from them; against the murder of bishops, priests, or deacons; against the offering of human sacrifices, and against some barbaric superstitions.[q] All persons were to pay a tenth part of their

[j] "Solitâ simulatione," says the annalist. Einh. 780.

[k] Einhard, A.D. 782; Poëta Saxo, ap. Pertz, i. 238; Ozanam, 249.

[m] Sismondi, ii. 294; Luden, iv. 337; Martin, ii. 405.

[n] Einhard, A.D. 785; Martin, ii. 409; Rettberg, ii. 407-8.

[o] Einhard, Vit. Car. 14; Gibbon, iv. 500; Rettberg, ii. 384.

[p] "Capitula de partibus Saxoniæ" (Paderborn, A.D. 785). Pertz, Leges, i. 48-50.

[q] "Si quis a diabolo deceptus crediderit, secundum morem paganorum, virum aliquem aut fœminam strigam

"substance and labour" to the church.[r] All children were to be baptised within a year from their birth, and parents who should neglect to comply with the law were to be fined in proportion to their quality. Fines were also enacted against those who should sacrifice in groves or do any other act of pagan worship. In the case of those offences which were punishable with death, this law did not admit the pecuniary commutations which were a feature of all the Germanic codes; but instead of them there was the remarkable provision, that, if any person guilty of such offences would of his own accord confess them to a priest, and express a desire to do penance, his life should be spared on the testimony of the priest.[s] The severity of this law was unlike the general character of Charles's legislation and was meant to be only temporary. It was modified by a capitulary twelve years later, which again allowed the principle of composition for capital offences.[t]

The conversion of the Saxons was urged on by a variety of measures. Gifts and threats were employed.[u] Charlemagne offered them union with the Franks on equal terms, freedom from tribute, and exemption from all other imposts except tithes.[x] Bishopricks were gradually established among them, monasteries were founded in thinly inhabited districts, towns grew up around these new foundations, and each became a centre for diffusing the knowledge of religion and of civilisation.[y] Hostages were committed to bishops and abbots for instruction;[z] and, by a strong measure of policy, ten thousand Saxons were in 804 removed from their own country into the older Frankish territory, where they became incorporated with the conqueror's original subjects.[a]

A like system of extending the profession of the Gospel with his conquests was pursued by Charlemagne in other quarters—as

esse et homines comedere, et propter hoc ipsam incenderit, vel *carnem ejus ad comedendum dederit, vel ipsam comederit*, capitis sententia punietur." (c. 6.) On the words in italics, which are clearly directed against *superstition*, Ozanam absurdly founds a charge of *cannibalism* against the Germans. (227.) Comp. Rettberg, ii. 390. Grimm contrasts this law with the superstition which has prevailed in some places even to our own times—"It is not witchcraft, but the killing of supposed witches, that the enlightened law denounces as diabolical and heathen." Deutsche Mythol. 1021.

[r] By a constitution of the preceding year (784) the Saxons were bound to annex a glebe (*mansus*) to every church and to pay tenths and ninths (payments which will be explained hereafter, c. IX. iii. 14) to the bishops and clergy. (Pertz, Leges, ii. Append. 1.) But the document is questionable, and the editor especially suspects the order as to *ninths*.

[s] Cap. 14.

[t] Capitul. Saxon. A.D. 797; Pertz, Leges, i. 75; Comp. Rettberg, ii. 591.

[u] Alcuin, Ep. 3. (A.D. 790.)

[x] Rettberg, ii. 409-410.

[y] Mabillon, III. xxxiii.; Ozanam, 260. For the dates of the Saxon bishopricks, see Schröckh, xix. 270; Rettberg, ii. 417; Gieseler, II. i. 143.

[z] See a list in Pertz, Leges, I. 89 (A.D. 802). This was repeatedly done. Rettberg, ii. 392.

[a] Einhard, 8; Rettberg, ii. 392.

among the Frisians, the Wiltzes, (a Slavonic people north of the Elbe,) the Bavarians, the Avars in Pannonia, and the Bohemians. Among the missionaries who were active in the work of conversion were Gregory, abbot of Utrecht;[b] Liudger, a Frisian, who had studied under Alcuin at York, and became bishop of Minigardeneford (Munster);[c] Willehad, a Northumbrian, bishop of Bremen;[d] Sturmi, of Fulda,[e] and Arno, archbishop of Salzburg.[f] Ingo, who laboured in Carinthia, may be mentioned on account of the singular means which he took to convince the heathens of their inferior condition—admitting some Christian slaves to his own table, while for their unconverted masters food was set outside the door, as for dogs. The inquiries to which this distinction gave rise are said to have resulted in a great accession of converts.[g]

But although the policy of Charlemagne did much to spread the profession of Christianity, the means which he employed were open to serious objection. The enforcement of tithes naturally raised a prejudice against the faith of which this payment was made a condition, and in 793 it even produced a revolt of the Saxons.[h] Alcuin often remonstrated against the unwise exaction.[i] He acknowledged the lawfulness of tithes; but how, he asked, would an impost which was ill borne even by persons who had been brought up in the catholic Church, be endured by a rude and barbarous race of neophytes? Would the Apostles have enforced it in such circumstances? When confirmed in the faith, the converts might properly be subjected to such burdens; but until then, it would be a grievous error to risk the faith itself for the sake of tithes. In like manner he argued against the indiscriminate administration of baptism. Instruction, he said, should first be given in the great heads of Christian doctrine and practice, and then the sacrament should follow. Baptism may be forced on men, but belief cannot. Baptism received without understanding or faith by a person capable of reason, is but an unprofitable washing of the body.[k] He urges that new converts should be treated with great tenderness, and that able preachers, of such character as may not bring discredit on their teaching, should be sent to instruct them.[m]

[b] See p. 106.

[c] Vita S. Liudgeri, Pertz, ii. 405, seqq.: on the name of his see, see Rettberg, ii. 429.

[d] Vita, ap. Pertz, ii. 380.

[e] See p. 102.

[f] Schröckh, xix. 288; Rettberg, ii. 238. Alcuin calls Arno *brother*, which has been supposed to mean that they were related in that degree; but he also calls him *father* and *son*. Rettberg, ii. 237.

[g] Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum, c. 7 (Pertz, xi.).

[h] Döllinger, i. 319.

[i] Epp. 28, 31, 37, 79, 80, &c.

[k] Ep. 31.

[m] Ep. 87.

During the latter part of the Merovingian period, learning had continually declined. A new era of intellectual activity now began.[n] Charlemagne's education had been neglected, but he made earnest efforts to repair the defects of his early training. He began in mature age to learn the art of writing; but, although he practised diligently, he never attained facility in it, or, at least, he was unable to master the difficulties of the ornamental calligraphy on which the professional writers of the time prided themselves.[o] We are told that he became as familiar with Latin as with his mother-tongue, and that, although unable to express himself with readiness in Greek, he was well acquainted with the language.[p] The object of his endeavours was necessarily rather to revive the ancient Roman culture than to originate a new literature;[q] yet while he encouraged the study of the classic languages among his subjects, he did not neglect his native German; he laboured to raise it to the rank of a cultivated tongue by reducing it to a grammatical system, he collected its old heroic ballads, and gave Teutonic names to the winds and to the months.[r] And, although his care for the German was little seconded in his own time,[s] and although the Latin had become the authorised language of the Church, a vernacular literature now arose which had much influence on the education of the people. Among its remains are poems and hymns, metrical harmonies of the Gospels, and glosses on the Bible, for the use of the clergy.[t]

The instruments of the intellectual reform which Charlemagne contemplated were not to be found in his own dominions. He therefore sought for them from Italy, from England, and from Ireland, the only countries of the West in which the study of general learning was then pursued.[u] The chief of these were Paul Warnefrid, a Lom-

[n] Guizot, iii. 207, 330; Ampère, iii. 2; Ellendorf, i. 309.

[o] "Tentabat et scribere, *tabulasque et codicillos ad hoc in lecto sub cervicalibus circumferre solebat, ut, cum vacuum tempus esset, manum literis effingendis assuesceret;* sed parum successit labor præposterus et sero inchoatus." (Einhard, 25.) From this it has been inferred that he could not write. (Gibbon, iv. 501—who, by omitting the words here printed in italics, deprives his readers of a somewhat important part of the evidence; Sismondi, ii. 319; Hallam, ii. 351, and Suppl. Notes, 388.) The meaning, however, seems rather to be that he *could* write, although not well or easily. Pagi (xiii. 154), Schröckh (xx. 48), Ampère (iii. 36-8), Bähr (Karolingische Litteratur, 15), and Ozanam (530), understand the words to relate not to ordinary but to ornamental writing; the authors of the Histoire Littéraire (iv. 370), to the large character which again came into use in Charlemagne's time. That the emperor used a mark by way of signature, does not, as has been sometimes supposed, prove that he was unable to write his name. See Maitland, "Dark Ages," 13-5.

[p] Einhard, 25.

[q] Bähr, Karol. Litt. 18.

[r] Einhard, 29.

[s] See Luden, iv. 209-210, 570.

[t] Gieseler, II. i. 91-2.

[u] The monk of St. Gall, who wrote a gossiping and not very authentic life of the Emperor—deriving his materials chiefly from the current popular stories of his time (Hist. Litt. v. 616; Bähr,

bard, Peter of Pisa, and—the most important for talents, for influence, and for the length of his labours among the Franks—Alcuin, a native of Northumbria.[x]

Alcuin was born about the year 735. After having studied in the cathedral school of York, under Egbert, brother of the Northumbrian king, and afterwards archbishop, he was ordained a deacon,[y] and became master of the school, which he raised to such reputation that many foreigners resorted to it for instruction.[z] He had already visited the Continent, when Eanbald, his old fellow-pupil, on being promoted to the see of York in 780, sent him to Rome for the purpose of bringing back the pall, the symbol of the archiepiscopal dignity which had been recovered for York by Egbert after having been suspended since the time of Paulinus. At Parma, Alcuin fell in with Charlemagne, who wished him to settle in France. With the permission of his own king and of Eanbald, he accepted the invitation, and was appointed to the master- A.D. 782-796. ship of the Palatine school,[a] an institution which had existed under the Merovingians,[b], and was now revived. This school accompanied the movements of the court. The pupils were the members of the royal family, with noble youths who belonged to the household, or had been permitted by the sovereign to partake of the education thus provided.[c] Charlemagne himself, with his sons, his daughters, and some of his courtiers, became the scholars of Alcuin.[d] It has been supposed that they formed an academy, in which each bore the name of some ancient worthy; thus Charles himself is styled David, Alcuin is Flaccus, Angilbert is Homer. But the only evidence in favour of the supposition is the fact that such names are used in correspondence.[e] Alcuin's instructions were given rather in the form of conversation than of lectures.[f] He

238)—tells us that, finding the means of intellectual cultivation far short of his wishes, he exclaimed, "Would that I had twelve clerks as learned as Jerome and Augustine!" Alcuin replied, "The Creator of heaven and earth has had no more like those two; and *you* would have twelve!" Pertz, ii. 734.

[x] Vita Alcuini, in Froben's edition of his works, and in Mabillon, vol. v.; Lorenz, Life of Alcuin, transl. by Jane M. Slee, London, 1837; Alcuin, par F. Mounier, Paris, 1853.

[y] Mounier (17) and others say that Mabillon is mistaken in supposing him a monk.

[z] Vita, 2-5; Lorenz, 8-11.

[a] Lorenz (12-4), Pagi (xiii. 151), and Luden (iv. 384, 552), think that, although he visited France in 782, he did not settle there until 793.

[b] See Pitra, Vie de S. Léger; Ozanam, 459.

[c] Ozanam, 459-464, 537; Gieseler, II. i. 84.

[d] Einhard, Vit. Car. 19.

[e] See Schröckh, xix. 50-2; Guizot, ii. 242; Lorenz, 20-48, 150-2; Mounier, 56, 88; Luden, v. 206, 568.

[f] Guizot, ii. 238. The dialogue between Alcuin and the prince Pipin, which M. Guizot quotes as a specimen of the teaching, is, however, said to be really translated or copied from a Greek work of the time of Hadrian. Finlay, ii. 268.

taught the seven sciences which were distinguished as liberal, and were afterwards classified under the titles of *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*—the Trivium ethical, consisting of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics; the Quadrivium physical,—arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy; while above these two classes was a third—Theology.[g] His writings on these subjects contain little of an original kind, and they may be regarded as mere notebooks of his teaching.[h] His other works are very various—commentaries on scripture, liturgical treatises, tracts on the controversies of the age and on practical religion, lives of saints, poems, and a large collection of letters. They appear to be justly described by Fleury as displaying more of labour than of genius, more of memory than of invention and taste;[i] but in estimating the merit of the man we are bound to compare him with his contemporaries. His work was that of a reviver.[k]

Alcuin was not only the instructor of Charlemagne in religion and letters, but his most confidential adviser in affairs of state. After having taught the Palatine school for fourteen years (with the interval of a visit to his native country), he became weary of a court life, and expressed a wish to retire to Fulda for the remainder of his days; but Charlemagne provided another retreat for him, by bestowing on him the abbacy of St. Martin, at Tours,
A.D. 796. a monastery of great wealth, but notorious for the disorderly character of its inmates;[m] and with this he retained some other preferments which he had before received. Alcuin in some measure reformed the monks of St. Martin's, although an affray in which they were concerned towards the end of his life proves that the reformation was imperfect.[n] He enriched the library of the abbey by importing books from England, and raised its school to great fame. We are told by his old biographer that he would not allow his scholars to read the "falsehoods" of Virgil, in which he had formerly delighted, and that when one of them secretly transgressed the rule, Alcuin miraculously detected him.[o] Rabanus Maurus, afterwards abbot of Fulda and archbishop of Mentz, Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, and other eminent men of the next generation, were among his

[g] Ampère, iii. 73-4; Rettberg, ii. 798. The first mention of this cycle of sciences is in St. Augustine De Ordine, lib. ii.; Gieseler, II. i. 82. See, however, Hauréau, i. 20-1.

[h] Mounier, 30, seqq.

[i] xlv. 19.

[k] Bähr, 348.

[m] Vita, 6; Lorenz, 131; Mounier, 236-8.

[n] To this affair relate Epp. 118, 119, 195. Charlemagne was very angry with the monks, and with Alcuin for supporting them in their misconduct. See his letter, Bouquet, v. 628, and below, c. IX. v. 10.

[o] Vita, 10.

pupils during this period.[p] He kept up a frequent correspondence with Charlemagne on politics, literature, science, and theology, and (as we shall see hereafter) he continued to take part in the controversies of the time. From some of his letters it appears that he was dissatisfied on account of the novelties introduced into the teaching of the Palatine school by his successor, an Irishman named Clement.[q] At length he obtained the emperor's leave to devolve the care of discipline in each of his monasteries on younger men,[r] and he died in 804.[s]

Charlemagne was bent on improving the education of every class among his subjects. He urged his nobles to study, and loudly reproved those who considered their position as an excuse for negligence.[t] The laity were required to learn the Creed and the Lord's Prayer,—in Latin, if possible, with a view to bringing them within the Roman influence. Fasting and blows were sometimes denounced against those who should disobey.[u] But it was found that the hardness of the task was regarded by many persons as even more formidable than such penalties; and it also appeared that many of the clergy were themselves unable to teach the forms in Latin. The re-enactments and the mitigations of such rules sufficiently prove how difficult it was to carry them into execution.[x] The clergy were charged to explain the Creed and the Lord's Prayer to their people,[y] and sponsors at baptism were required to prove their acquaintance with both.[z]

Charlemagne took great pains to improve the education of the clergy. In 769 he ordered that any clergyman who should disregard his bishop's admonitions to learn should be suspended or deprived.[a] In 787 he issued a circular to all metropolitans, bishops, and abbots, complaining of the incorrect style which appeared in many letters addressed to him from monasteries. This want of skill in writing, he says, leads him to apprehend that there may be also an inability to understand the language of Scripture rightly; he therefore orders that competent masters should be established, and that study should be diligently urged on.[b] Two years later

[p] Hist. Litt. iv. 14; Lorenz, 169-173. For the eminent men formed under Charlemagne and Alcuin, see Ellendorf, i. 315; Mounier, 188.

[q] See Mounier, 95-9.

[r] Epp. 175-6.

[s] Schröckh, xix. 87.

[t] Monach. Sangall. i. 3.

[u] Capit. A.D. 804, ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 130; Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 45.

[x] Gieseler, II. i. 90-1; Rettberg, ii. 36, 454-6.

[y] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 69; Pertz, Leges, i. 64. Hatto, bishop of Basel, about 820, orders that the forms be learnt "tam Latine quam barbarice." Hard. iv. 1240.

[z] Capit. A.D. 804; Pertz, Leges, i. 128.

[a] Pertz, Leges, i. 34.

[b] Encycl. de litteris colendis. Pertz, Leges, i. 52.

he ordered that there should be a school in every cathedral and monastery, open not only to the servile class (from which the clergy were usually taken), but to the freeborn; that instruction should be given in psalmody, music, *computum*,[c] and grammar; and that care should be taken for the correct writing of the service-books.[d] He employed Paul Warnefrid to compile a book of homilies from the Fathers, and published it with a preface in his own name. These homilies were arranged according to the ecclesiastical seasons. It seems to have been at first intended that they should be read in Latin, the language of the church and of the state; and that it was a concession to national feeling when councils of the emperor's last year directed the clergy, in using them, to render them into a tongue intelligible to the people—the "rustic Roman" of Gaul, or the Teutonic, as might be.[e] As the manuscripts of the Scriptures had been generally much corrupted by careless transcription, Charlemagne, with Alcuin's assistance, provided for the multiplication of correct copies.[f] While the pupils of the schools were employed in transcribing the less important books for churches, none but persons of mature age were allowed to copy the gospels, the psalter, or the missal.[g] Manuscripts were acquired for libraries from England, Italy, and Greece.[h] Presbyters were before ordination to be examined as to their faith, as to their knowledge of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, of the canons, the penitential, the gospels, the homilies of the Fathers, the public services, the rites of baptism and the eucharist, and their power of instructing their flocks.[i]

In addition to the education of the clergy, a new feature appears in the Articles of Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, where it is ordered that in every parish the clergy should provide a school for freeborn children as well as for serfs. The payment for instruction was to be only such as the parents of the pupils should freely give. The bishop also invites the clergy to send their relations to the monastic schools.[k] But the attempt to establish parochial schools does not appear to have been much acted on even in the diocese

[c] i.e. the computation of the Calendar. Ducange in voc.

[d] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 71; Pertz, Leges, i. 65; Cf. Conc. Cabilon. A.D. 813, c. 3. For an account of the most famous cathedral and monastic schools under Charlemagne, see Hist. Litt. iv. 12-7.

[e] Bouquet, v. 622; Pertz, Leges, i. 45; Conc. Rem. II. (813), c. 15; Conc. Turon. III. (813), c. 17.

[f] Capit. A.D. 782; Pertz, Leges, i. 45; Hist. Litt. iv. 19-20; Schröckh, xix. 48-9; xx. 197.

[g] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 71.

[h] Lorenz, 56.

[i] A.D. 802, Pertz, Leges, i. 107. Cf. Capit. A.D. 811; ib. 171.

[k] Theodulph. Capit. xix.-xx. (A.D. 797.) Hardouin, iv. 916.

of Orleans, and there is no evidence of its having been imitated by other bishops.[m]

Charlemagne paid much deference to the usages of Rome, as the most venerable church of the West. In 774 he obtained from Adrian the code of canons used at Rome, and in 789 he published such of them as he considered necessary for his own dominions.[n] The Roman method of chanting had been already introduced into Gaul. Pope Paul had sent books of it to Pipin, and had endeavoured to procure its establishment; but, although he was supported by Pipin in the attempt,[o] the Gallican chant still prevailed. On Charlemagne's third visit to Rome, in 787, disputes arose between the Frankish and the Roman clergy on the subject of the liturgy and the chant. The Franks relied on the king's protection; but, to their dismay, he asked them, "Which is purer—the stream or the source?" and he acted on the answer which they felt themselves obliged to give.[p] He carried back into France two skilful clerks to teach the Roman chant, and stationed one of them at Metz, while the other accompanied the court.[q] He also established the sacramentary of Gregory the Great in the Frankish Church, and ordered the books of the Ambrosian rite to be either destroyed or sent across the Alps.[r] Charlemagne paid especial attention to the solemnity of divine worship. The cathedral of Aix, which he built, was adorned with marble pillars from Rome and Ravenna, and was furnished with vestments for all its clergy, down to the meanest of the doorkeepers.[s] He diligently frequented the services of his chapel[t] both by day and night, and took great pains to improve both the reading and the singing; "for," says Einhard, "he was very skilful in both, although he neither read publicly nor sang, except in a low voice and together with others."[u] A biographer of more questionable authority gives an amusing account of the manner in which the emperor directed the reading in his

[m] Guizot, ii. 259; Gieseler, II. i. 90.

[n] Comp. Hardouin, iii. 2033, seqq., with iv. 826, or Pertz, Leges, i. 54.

[o] See Capit. 789. 79, ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 60; Pagi, xii. 645.

[p] Baron. 787. 68-9.

[q] Hist. Litt. iv. 23; Guéranger, i. 351-4.

[r] Gieseler, II. i. 70. The rough voices of the Franks were still complained of, as in the time of Gregory (p. 5). The monk of Angoulême tells us that they learnt the Roman chant, "excepto quod tremulas vel vinnulas sive collisibiles vel secabiles voces in cantu non poterant perfecte exprimere Franci, naturali voce barbarica frangentes in gutture voces potius quam experimentes." (Pertz, i. 171.) The editor shows, from Isidore of Seville, that the epithet *vinnulus* or *cinnulus*, comes from *vinnus*, a curl—*cincinnus mollitèr flexus*.

[s] Einhard, 16.

[t] The chapel of the Frank kings was so called from the *cappa* or cloak of St. Martin, which was kept in it. Ducange, s. v. *Capella*. Thomassin, however (I. ii. 109), identifies the word with *capsa*, a reliquary.

[u] Einhard, 26.

chapel. He used to point with his finger or with his staff at any person[x] whom he wished to read; and when thus ordered to begin, or when warned by a cough[y] from the emperor to stop, the reader was expected to obey at once, without any regard to sense or to the division of sentences. Thus, it is said, all were kept in a state of continual attention, because any one might be set on at any moment. No one could mark his own portion with his nail or with wax, and all became accomplished readers whether able or not to understand the language and the matter.[z] Charlemagne himself is said to have composed hymns—among them the "Veni Creator Spiritus."[a]

Charlemagne's ecclesiastical legislation was carried on by his own authority. He regarded it as the duty of a sovereign to watch over the spiritual and moral well-being of his subjects; he alleges the reforms of Josiah as a scriptural precedent for the part which he took in the regulation of the Church.[b] Ecclesiastical subjects occupy more than a third of his capitularies.[c] The ecclesiastical as well as the other laws were proposed in the assemblies which were held yearly in March and in autumn, and which bore at once the character of synods and of *malls* or diets. The clergy and the laity sat together or separately[d] as was most convenient, according to the nature of the subjects proposed to them. Discussion was allowed; but both the initiative and the decision belonged to the sovereign, and in his name the decrees were published.[e]

The coronation of Charlemagne as emperor, although it did not add to the power which he before possessed over his subjects, gave a new and indefinite majesty to his position. He was no longer the chief of a nation of warriors, but the representative of the ancient Roman traditions and civilisation, the anointed head of Western Christendom.[f] The empire was to be a consecrated state,

[x] The writer's language seems to imply that he means to speak of the household in general, and not of the clergy only.

[y] "Sono gutturis."

[z] Monach. Sangall. i. 7.

[a] Guérangér, i. 188.

[b] Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 789; Pertz, Leges, i. 54.

[c] 415 out of 1126; Guizot, ii. 198. On the character of the capitularies, see Guizot, p. 230.

[d] Thus, in 813, assemblies were convened at Arles, Mentz, Tours, and Chalons-sur-Saône. In these the bishops treated on matters of faith and discipline, the monks and abbots on monastic life, and the counts and judges on secular questions. See Hardouin, iv. 1008; Luden, v. 148.

[e] De Marca, VI. xxv. 5; Pagi, xiii. 119; Guizot, ii. 194-6; Gieseler, ii. 57; Martin, ii. 382; Milman, ii. 288; Rettberg, i. 424; Ellendorf, i. 233, seqq. For some strong expressions of synods as to Charlemagne's ecclesiastical position, see Ellendorf, i. 234-5.

[f] Hallam, i. 10, and Suppl. Notes, 27; Sismondi, ii. 383; Rettberg, i. 432-5; Palgrave, Norm. and Eng. i. 27-8; Milman, ii. 271.

with him for its ruler in ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs, and directing all to the glory of God.[g] In 802 an oath of allegiance to him as emperor was required of those who had already sworn to him as king;[h] and whereas such oaths had not before been imposed among the Franks, except on persons who held office or benefice under the crown, all males above the age of twelve were now required to swear.[i] The civil hierarchy in all its grades corresponded to the ecclesiastical; and forthwith a new system of commissioners (*Missi Dominici*)[k] was set on foot. These were chosen partly from the higher ecclesiastics and partly from the laity. They were to be men superior to all suspicion, fear, or partiality: they were to make circuits for the inspection of both secular and spiritual matters; they were to control the local administrations, to take care of churches, of widows, orphans, and the poor, to exercise a censorship of morals; to redress wrongs, or to refer to the emperor such as were beyond their power; to see to the due execution of the laws which were passed in the national assemblies.[m] In spiritual as well as in temporal affairs, the emperor was regarded as the highest judge—beyond him no appeal could be made;[n] in authorising the canons of Adrian's collection, he omitted that of Sardica which prescribed a reference to the bishop of Rome. He cultivated friendly relations with the popes, acknowledged them as the highest of bishops, and often consulted them and acted on their suggestions; but the authority by which these were enforced on his subjects was his own; nor did the popes attempt to interfere with the powers which he claimed. On the conquest of Italy, he assumed the same control over the ecclesiastical affairs of that country which he had been accustomed to exercise in his hereditary kingdom, and the popes submitted to him as their lord and judge.[o] Lofty titles and flattering language were, indeed, often addressed by bishops and others of the Franks to the successors of St. Peter; but the real amount of the authority which these enjoyed during this period is to be measured by the facts of history, not by the exaggerations of rhetorical or interested compliment.[p]

[g] Pfister, i. 436; Palgrave, i. 397; Rettberg, i. 432; Milman, ii. 276.

[h] Pertz, Leges, i. 91.

[i] Martin, ii. 467.

[k] Pfister, i. 452-3; Ellendorf, i. 257.

[m] See the instructions to them when first sent out, April 802. Pertz, Leges, i. 197; Comp. De Marca, IV. vii. 6-8; Guizot, ii. 192; Rettberg, i. 433-4, 456.

[n] Gfrörer, 'Karolinger,' i. 74.

[o] Gieseler, II. i. 40-2; Rettberg, ii. 439. M. Lehuërou, however, argues that he held his superiority over the Roman church in the character of its *Defensor*, like the advocates or Vidames of lesser churches. (See below, c. IX. iii. 10.) Instit. Merov. et Carolingiennes, ii. 358-360.

[p] See Planck, ii. 769, 785, 797-8; Gieseler, II. i. 60-1.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EASTERN CHURCH—CONTROVERSIES OF CHARLEMAGNE'S AGE.

A.D. 775-814.

I. Constantine Copronymus was succeeded in 775 by his son Leo IV. The new emperor was opposed to the worship of images; but his character was milder and more tolerant than that of his father or of his grandfather. Although the laws remained unaltered, the monks, who had been persecuted and banished, were now allowed to return; and a great excitement was raised by the reappearance of these confessors in the cause of the popular religion. The empress, Irene, was of an Athenian family noted for its devotion to images, and herself cherished an enthusiastic reverence for them. Her father-in-law, Constantine, had compelled her to forswear them; but she appears to have thought that in so sacred a cause her oath was not binding. She now exerted her influence as far as she dared; by her means some monks and other friends of images were promoted to bishopricks, although for the time they were obliged to conceal their opinions.[a]

Notwithstanding the general mildness of Leo's character, his feeling on the subject of images was strong; and, when some of them had been found under Irene's pillow, he ordered some great officers, who had been concerned in introducing them into the palace, to be flogged and tonsured; he put one, who had especially provoked him, to death; and he separated from the empress, although she denied all concern in the affair.[b]

After a reign of four years and a half Leo died,—more probably by a natural consequence of the illness with which he had long been afflicted than either by a miracle of judgment on his impiety, or (as some modern writers have supposed) by poison.[c]

[a] Theophanes, 596; Gibbon, iv. 412-3, 492; Schlosser, 250-3.

[b] Theophan. 701; Schlosser, 258-9. Mr. Finlay questions this story. ii. 83.

[c] Theophanes (702) says that Leo, being excessively fond of jewels, took down and wore a crown adorned with very precious gems, which hung in the cathedral; that in punishment of this sacrilege, carbuncles broke out in the spots where the crown had touched his head, and that he died in consequence. The supposition of poison is put forward, more or less positively, by Spanheim (789), Basnage (359), Mosheim (ii. 65), and, of course, by Gfrörer (ii. 155): but is declared by Schlosser (259) to be groundless.

Irene was left in possession of the government, as guardian of her son Constantine, a boy ten years old. But she felt that it was necessary to proceed with caution in carrying out her wishes. She was, indeed, sure of the monks and of the populace: but the authority of a council, which claimed the title of Ecumenical, was against her; the great body of the bishops was opposed to images; and, although the well tried pliancy of the eastern clergy gave reasons for hoping that these might be gained, there was a strong iconoclastic party among the laity, while the soldiery adhered to the principles of the late emperor, whose memory was cherished among them as that of a brave and successful general.[d] At first, therefore, she ventured no further than to publish an edict for general liberty of conscience. The monks who were still in exile returned, images were again displayed, and many tales of sufferings and miracles swelled the popular excitement.[e] A.D. 780.

In August 784, Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, suddenly resigned his dignity, and retired into a monastery, where he was visited by Irene and some high officers of the empire. When questioned as to the reason of his resignation, he professed deep remorse for having consented to accept the patriarchate on condition of opposing the restoration of images; he deplored the condition of his church, oppressed as it was by the tyranny of the state, and at variance with the rest of Christendom; and he declared that the only remedy for its evils would be to summon a general council for the purpose of reversing the decrees of the iconoclastic synod which had been held under Constantine.[f] We need not seek for an explanation of Paul's motives in the supposition of collusion with the court. He may, like many others, have been sincerely attached to the cause of images, and, when seized with sickness, may have felt a real compunction for the compliances by which he had gained his elevation. And his death, which followed immediately after, is a strong confirmation of this view.[g]

Irene summoned the people of the capital to elect a new patriarch. No one possessed of the requisite qualifications was to be found among the higher clergy, as the bishops were disaffected to the cause of images, while the abbots were too ignorant of the management of affairs. The person selected by the court, and,

[d] Walch, x. 527; Gibbon, iv. 492.
[e] Theophan. 704.
[f] Hard. iv. 37; Theophan. 708; Schlosser, 271-6.
[g] Neander, v. 311-2. Basnage and Spanheim groundlessly suppose that Paul was *deposed*. See Walch, x. 509.

according to one writer,[h] suggested by Paul himself, was Tarasius, a secretary of state, a man of noble birth, of consular dignity, and of good personal reputation. The multitude, who had no doubt been carefully prompted, cried out for his election, and the few dissentient voices were overpowered. Tarasius, with an appearance of modesty, professed his reluctance to accept an office so foreign to his previous habits, and declared that he would only do so on condition that a general council should be forthwith summoned for the consideration of the all-engrossing subject.[i] With this understanding he was consecrated; and Adrian of Rome, on receiving a statement of his faith, admitted him to communion, professing to consider the exigency of the case an excuse for the irregularity of his promotion.[k]

A council was now summoned, to meet at Constantinople, and measures were taken to render it more imposing than the numerous synods which had condemned images under the last reign. The pope was invited to send representatives, if unable to attend in person.[m] He deputed Peter, chief presbyter of his church, with Peter, abbot of St. Sabas, and furnished them with a letter, in which he hailed the emperor and his mother as a new Constantine and a new Helena, and exhorted them to repair the misdeeds of their predecessors by restoring images in the church.[n] Some things of a less agreeable kind were added;—a demand for the restoration of all that the iconoclastic emperors had taken from St. Peter, remarks on the irregularity of raising a layman to the patriarchate of Constantinople, and objections to the title of Ecumenical, which had been given to Tarasius in the imperial letter.[o]

As the empire was at peace with the Saracens, invitations were also addressed to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. But the bearers of these letters fell in with some

[h] Ignatius, in his Life of Tarasius. See Walch, x. 493. But the story is unsupported and improbable. Ib. 509.

[i] Hard. iv. 24-5; Theophan. 709-712.

[k] Hard. iv. 97; Theophan. 713.

[m] Hard. iv. 22; Walch, x. 532.

[n] Hard. iv. 79-92.

[o] Ibid., 93-6. Basnage (1362), Gibbon (iv. 492), and others suppose that the two Roman presbyters had no special commission and were disowned by the pope on their return. The only authority for this is Theodore the Studite, who states (Ep. I. 38, p. 254), that the envoys were deposed, "as they say," because they had been sent on other business, notwithstanding that they professed to have been *forced* to act in the council; and that Rome regarded it as only a *local* synod. But Theodore's statement is contradicted by the documents, and is supposed to have arisen out of the circumstance that, when the meeting of the council was deferred, the legates did not procure any *new* commission. (Schlosser, 288; Neander, v. 314-5.) Theodore was inclined to disparage the council because he thought it too lenient in its treatment of persons who had formerly opposed images.

monks, who, on learning the object of their journey, earnestly implored them to proceed no further, since any such communication from the empire would be sure to exasperate the jealousy of the Mahometan tyrants, and to bring additional oppressions on the Church. They offered to send to the Council two of their own number, whom they proposed to invest with the character of *synceUi* to the patriarchs; these, they said, would sufficiently represent the faith of the eastern church, and the personal attendance of the patriarchs was no more requisite than that of the Roman bishop. The messengers agreed to this strange proposal, and returned to Constantinople with two monks named John and Thomas.[p]

The Council was to meet at Constantinople in the beginning of August 786. But during the week before the appointed day, the opponents of images held meetings for the purpose of agitation, and, although Tarasius ordered them to leave the city, many of them still remained. On the eve of the opening, there was an outbreak of some imperial guards and other soldiers belonging to the iconoclastic party; and on the following day a still more serious tumult took place. When Tarasius and other members of the Council were assembled in the church of the Apostles, a multitude of soldiers and others, aided by some iconoclastic bishops, broke in on them, and compelled them to take refuge in the sanctuary. The soldiers who were summoned to quell the uproar refused to obey orders. Tarasius ordered the doors of the sanctuary to be shut. The iconoclasts forced them, but, without being dismayed by the threatening appearance, the patriarch opened the council, and conducted its proceedings until a message arrived from Irene, desiring her friends to give way,[q] on which the iconoclastic bishops raised a shout of victory. The empress allowed the matter to rest until, having lulled suspicion, she was able quietly to disband the mutinous soldiers and to send them to their native places;[r] and in September of the following year, a synod of about 350 bishops, with a number of monks and other clergy, met at Nicæa, a place at once safer from disturbance than the capital, and of venerable name, as having been the seat of the first general council.[s]

The first places of dignity were given to the Roman envoys, who had been recalled, after having proceeded as far as Sicily on their

[p] Hard. iv. 136-141, 456; Spanh. 805-8; Walch, x. 551-8. Schlosser (281) not altogether unfairly reminds us of Pseudartabas in the 'Acharnians.'

[q] Hard. iv. 25-8; Theophan. 714-5; Walch, x. 535-7; Schlosser, 285-6.

[r] Theophan. 715-6.

[s] On the number of which the council consisted, see Walch, x. 550; Schlosser, 288-9.

way homeward.[t] Next to these was Tarasius, the real president of the assembly;[u] and after him were the two representatives (if they may be so styled) of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. A number of civil dignitaries were also present.[x] The first session took place on the 24th of September, and the business proceeded with great rapidity. Six sessions were held within thirteen days; a seventh followed a week later (October 13th), and the final meeting was held at Constantinople on the 23rd of October.[y]

From the beginning it was assumed that the object was not to discuss the question, but to re-establish the worship of images; bishops who were known to be opposed to it had not been invited to attend.[z] The pope's letter was read at the second session, but with the omission of the reflections on Tarasius, and of the request that the rights of his see might be restored.[a] A number of bishops who had taken part in the iconoclasm of the last reigns, came forward to acknowledge and anathematise their errors, and humbly sued for admission to communion.[b] In answer to questions, some of them said that they had never until now had the means of rightly considering the subject; that they had been educated in error; that they had been deceived by forged or garbled authorities, or that they had been sealed up under a judicial blindness.[c] Questions arose as to admitting them to communion, as to recognising them in offices to which they had been consecrated by heretics,[d] and, with respect to some, whether, as they had formerly been persecutors of the faithful, they ought not to be treated with especial severity.[e] The monks were throughout on the side of rigour; but the majority of the council, under the guidance of Tarasius, was in favour of a lenient course. The canons were searched for precedents; and a question then arose as to the application of these—with what class of heretics were the iconoclasts to be reckoned? Tarasius was for putting them on the footing of Manichæans, Marcionites, and Monophysites, as these sects had also been opposed to images; he said that all heresies were alike heinous, because all did away with the law of God. The monastic party declared that iconomachy was worse than the worst of heresies, because it denied the Saviour's incarnation.[f] But the majority was disposed to treat the penitents with indulgence, and

[t] Hard. iv. 27; Walch, x. 538.
[u] Walch, x. 561-2.
[x] Hard. iv. 34.
[y] See Walch, x. 560, 579-580.
[z] Schlosser, 290.
[a] Hard. iv. 93.
[b] Ib. 37, seqq.
[c] Ib. 47, 166, 300, &c.
[d] Ib. 61.
[e] Ib. 125.
[f] Ib. 50-60.

they were received to communion.[g] There were loud outcries against the iconoclasts, as atheists, Jews, and enemies of the truth;[h] and when a proposal was made to call them Saracens, it was answered that the name was too good for them.[i]

According to the usual practice of councils, passages from the Fathers were read in behalf of images, and the opposition to them was paralleled or connected with all sorts of heresies.[k] The extracts produced from the earlier Fathers are really irrelevant; the images of which they speak were either scenes from sacred history, or memorial portraits, like that of Meletius of Antioch, which is mentioned by St. Chrysostom,[m] and they afford no sanction for the practices which were in question before the council.[n] A large portion of the readings consisted of extracts from legendary biographies, and of tales of miracles wrought by images, to which some of the bishops were able to add similar marvels from their own experience.[o] Curious commentaries were sometimes interspersed. Thus, after a passage from Gregory of Nyssa, in which he spoke of himself as having been affected to tears by a picture of the sacrifice of Isaac, a bishop observed, "The father had often read the history, but perhaps without ever weeping; yet, as soon as he saw the picture, he wept." "If," said another, "so great a doctor was edified and moved even to tears by a picture, how much more would it affect lay and unlearned people!" Many exclaimed that they had seen such pictures of Abraham as that which Gregory described; they did not, however, add that they had experienced the same emotion at the sight. "If Gregory wept at a painting of Abraham," said Theodore, bishop of Catana, "what should we do at one of the incarnate Saviour?" "Should not we too weep," asked Tarasius, "if we saw a picture of the crucifixion?" and his words were received with general applause.[p]

A famous story, which had already served the uses both of controversialists and of devotional writers, was twice read.[q] An aged monk on the Mount of Olives, it was said, was greatly tempted by a spirit of uncleanness. One day the demon appeared to him, and, after having sworn him to secrecy, offered to discontinue his assaults if the monk would give up worshipping a picture of the Blessed Virgin and the infant Saviour which hung in his

[g] Ib. 76, 129-136.
[h] Ib. 189.
[i] Ib. 292.
[k] Ib. 159, seqq.
[m] Ib. 164.
[n] See an analysis of the extracts in Dupin, vi. 140, seqq.
[o] *E. g.* Hard. iv. 185, 265-212.
[p] Ib. 165.
[q] Ib. 208, 316.

cell. The monk asked time to consider the proposal, and applied for advice to an abbot of renowned sanctity. The abbot regretted that he had been so far deluded as to swear to the devil, but told him that he had yet done well in laying open the matter, and that it would be better to visit every brothel in Jerusalem than to refrain from adoring the Saviour and His Mother in the picture. From this edifying tale, a moral was drawn with general consent,—that reverence for images would warrant not only unchastity, but breach of oaths; and that those who had formerly sworn to the iconoclast heresy were no longer bound by their obligations.[r]

At the fifth session, the Roman legates proposed that an image should be brought in and should receive the adoration of the assembly. This was solemnly done next day;[s] and at the same session the conclusions of the iconoclastic synod of 754 were read, each paragraph being followed by the corresponding part of a long refutation, which was declared to have been evidently dictated by the Holy Ghost.[t]

At the seventh session, the decree of the council was read and subscribed. It determined that, even as the figure of the cross was honoured, so images of the Saviour and the Blessed Virgin, of angels and of saints, whether painted or mosaic or of any other suitable material, are to be set up for kissing and honourable reverence (προσκύνησιν), but not for that real service (λατρείαν) which belongs to the Divine nature alone.[u] Incense and lights are to be offered to them, as to the cross, the Gospels, and other holy memorials; "forasmuch as the honour paid to the image passes on to the original, and he who adores an image adores in it the person of him whom it represents." An anathema was pronounced against all opponents of images, and the signing of the decree was followed by many acclamations in honour of the new Constantine and Helena, with curses against iconomachists and heretics of every kind.[x] These outcries were repeated at the eighth session, when the council appeared at one of the palaces of Constantinople, and both the emperor and his mother subscribed the decree.[y] The council, which after a time came to be regarded both by the

[r] Hard. 209.

[s] Ib. 321.

[t] Ib. 325; Schröckh, xx. 578-9.

[u] Hard. iv. 456. "We have," as Dean Milman remarks (ii. 186), "no word to distinguish between προσκύνησις and λατρεία." One of the council's arguments had been drawn from our Lord's answer to the tempter—"Thou shalt *worship* (προσκυνήσεις) the Lord thy God, and Him *only* shalt thou *serve* (λατρεύσεις)." *Service*, it was said, is here restricted to God *only*, but not so *worship*! Hard. iv. 204.

[x] Ib. 469-472.

[y] Ib. 481-5.

Greeks and by the Latins as the seventh General Council,[z] also passed twenty-two canons, chiefly on ecclesiastical and monastic discipline.[a] It is to be observed that the images sanctioned at Nicæa were not works of sculpture, but paintings and other flat representations—a limitation to which the Greek Church has ever since adhered;[b] and that there is as yet no mention of representing under visible forms the Trinity, the Almighty Father, or the Holy Spirit.[c]

Constantine VI. grew up in the society of women and eunuchs, and in entire subjection to his mother. With the view, perhaps, of cutting off from the iconoclasts the hope of assistance from the west, she had negotiated for him a marriage with one of Charlemagne's daughters; but, soon after the Nicene synod, as the iconoclasts were no longer formidable, while she may have feared that such a connexion might endanger her own ascendancy,[d] she broke off the engagement, greatly to the indignation of the Frankish king, and compelled her son against his will to marry an Armenian princess named Marina or Mary.[e] Instigated, it is said, by some persons who professed to have discovered by magic that the empire was to be her own, she paved the way for a change by encouraging her son in cruelties and debaucheries which rendered him odious to his subjects, and especially to the powerful monastic party.[f] At the age of twenty, Constantine resolved to throw off the yoke of his mother and her ministers; he succeeded in possessing himself of the government, and for some years the empire was distracted by revolutions, carried on with all the perfidy and atrocity which were characteristic of the later Greeks.[g] Constantine was at length persuaded to readmit his mother to a share of power, and she pursued towards him the same policy as before. He fell in love with a lady of her court, and resolved to divorce his wife and to marry the object of his new attachment. The patriarch Tarasius at first opposed the scheme: Constantine, it is said, threatened that, if the Church refused to indulge him, he would restore idolatry;[h] and Tarasius no longer

A.D. 781.

[z] On the history of its reception see Palmer on the Church, ii. 201, seqq. ed. l.

[a] See Hard. iv. 485, seqq.

[b] Basnage, 1364. They admit, however, of relief in the dresses and in the "glories," which are usually wrought in metal, while holes are left for the fleshy parts, which are painted on a flat surface.

[c] Mabillon, v.; Præf. xiv. Raoul-Rochette refers the first personal representations of the Almighty Father to the 9th century; Didron, to the 12th; Lindsay, on Christian Art, i. 75.

[d] Schlosser, 305; Finlay, ii. 93.

[e] Theophan. 705, 718; Einhard. Ann. 786; Schlosser, 300.

[f] Theophan. 719; Walch, x. 503.

[g] Theophan. 720-5; Finlay, ii. 94.

[h] τοὺς ναοὺς τῶν εἰδώλων ἀνοίξω. Cedrenus, 472, d. Walch (x. 554) very

ventured to resist.[i] Marina was shut up in a convent, and the second nuptials were magnificently celebrated in September 795.[k] Some monks, who vehemently objected to these proceedings and even went so far as to excommunicate the emperor, were treated with great cruelty.[m] It has been supposed that Irene even contrived the temptation to which her son yielded; she at least beheld his errors with malicious satisfaction, and fomented the general discontent which they produced.[n] By degrees she secured to her own interest all the persons who were immediately around him; and at length, when her scheme appeared to be matured, he was by her command seized at his devotions,[o] was carried into the purple chamber in which he had been born, and was deprived of his eyesight with such violence that the operation almost cost him his life.[p] Immediately after this, a fog of extraordinary thickness obscured the air and hid the sun for seventeen days. By the people of Constantinople it was regarded as declaring the sympathy of heaven with the horror generally felt at the unnatural deed by which Irene obtained the empire.[q]

Irene reigned six years after the dethronement of her son. According to the Greek writers, whose testimony, however, is unsupported by those of the west, she was engaged in a project for reuniting the empires by a marriage with Charlemagne,[r] when, in October 802, she was dethroned by the secretary Nicephorus, and was banished to Lesbos, where she died within a few months.[s]

Nicephorus, who is described by Theophanes as having surpassed

improbably supposes the threat to have been that Constantine would remove images, and that Cedrenus, in reporting the story, styles churches *without* images "temples of *idols*."

[i] Theophan. 727-8; Vit. Theodor. Studit. 18, 19, 26; Baron. 795. 43, seqq.

[k] Cedren. 472; Pagi, xiii. 301.

[m] Vit. Theod. Stud. 20; Baron. 795. 43-59.

[n] Theoph. 729; Schlosser, 310.

[o] εἰς παράκλησιν, says Theophanes. His translator renders the words "ad preces;" Goar (not. in loc.) understands παράκλησις to mean *a religious procession*; Schlosser (326), *a private chapel*.

[p] Theoph. 730-2. It has been very generally inferred from the historian's words that Constantine died under the operation. But Gibbon (iv. 414-5), Schlosser (327-330), and Finlay (ii. 100) show that he long survived.

[q] Cedrenus, 473. On the disgraceful manner in which writers favourable to the cause of images have attempted to palliate Irene's guilt, see Walch, x. 589; Milman, ii. 191. The words of Baronius are well known, but must be quoted here:—"Scelus plane execrandum, nisi justitiæ zelus ad id faciendum excitasset. . . . Si enim regnandi cupidine Irene in filium molita esset insidias, detestabilior Agrippina, Neronis matre, fuisset, cum illa suæ quoque vitæ dispendio filium imperare maluisset. Contra vero, quod ista religionis causa, amore justitiæ, in filium perpetrata creduntur, ab orientalibus nonnullis, qui facto aderant, viris sanctissimis eadem post hæc meruit præconio celebrari." 796. 8. Rohrbacher is little short of Baronius. (xi. 220-1.) Irene was canonised by the Greeks. Finlay, ii. 102.

[r] Theophan. 736; Cedren. 474. Against the story, see Gibbon, iv. 509; Schlosser, 338; Luden, v. 12-3.

[s] Theophan. 738-745; Gibbon, iv. 415-6.

all his predecessors in rapacity, lust and cruelty,[t] was bent on subjecting the hierarchy to the imperial power. He forbade the patriarch to correspond with the pope, whom he considered as a tool of Charlemagne; and he earned the detestation of the clergy by heavily taxing monastic and ecclesiastical property which had until then been exempt, by seizing the ornaments of churches, by stabling his horses in monasteries, and by extending a general toleration to iconoclasts and sectaries.[u] He was killed in a war with the Bulgarians in 811,[x] and his son Stauracius, after a reign of little more than two months, was thrust into a monastery, where he soon after died of wounds received before his accession.[y] Michael Rhangabe, brother-in-law of Stauracius, was compelled to accept the empire, and images were again restored to honour. The iconoclastic party, however, continued to exist. An attempt was made by some of its members to set up a blinded son of Constantine Copronymus on the throne;[z] and on the alarm of a Bulgarian invasion, soon after the elevation of Michael, a very remarkable display of its spirit took place. While the clergy, the monks, and vast numbers of the people, were deprecating the danger by processions and prayers, some iconoclastic soldiers broke open the mausoleum of the emperors, prostrated themselves on the tomb of Copronymus, and entreated him to save the state; and they asserted that he had appeared to them on horseback, and had gone forth against the barbarians, "whereas," says Theophanes, "he dwells in hell with devils."[a] Although the motive of these men was more probably fraud than fanaticism—(for, besides the story of the apparition, they pretended that the mausoleum had been opened by miracle)—we may infer the existence of a strong attachment to the memory of Constantine among the party to which the imposture was addressed.[b]

Michael, although a man of estimable character, proved unequal to the government of the empire. After a reign of two years, he was deposed and tonsured, while a general named Leo was raised to the throne. By a clemency unusual in such cases, Michael was allowed to retain not only his life but his eyesight, and he survived his dethronement thirty-two years.[c] A.D. 813.

[t] Theophan. 775-8, 765.
[u] Gibbon, iv. 494; Finlay, i. 110-6, 125. Mr. Finlay is rather favourable to him—partly, perhaps, on account of the emperor's enmity to the clergy.
[x] Theophan. 764; Pagi, xiii. 470; Gibbon, v. 2[illegible]
[y] Schlosser, 374-5.
[z] Theophan. 773.
[a] P. 781.
[b] See Walch, x. 546.
[c] Theophan. 779, 783-4; Gibbon, iv. 417; Schlosser says 35 years. 392.

II. While the decree of the second council of Nicæa established a reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople, and was gladly confirmed by the Pope, it met with a less favourable reception north of the Alps. In the Frankish Church a middle opinion on the subject of images had prevailed; as the eastern Christians had been led to cherish their images for the sake of contrast with their Mahometan neighbours, so the Franks were restrained from giving into the reverence for images by the necessity of opposing the idolatry of the unconverted Germans.[d] The question had been one of those discussed by a mixed assembly of clergy and laity which was held under Pipin at Gentilly, in the presence of envoys from Pope Paul and of ambassadors from Constantine Copronymus. Their decision on this point is not recorded; but there can be no reasonable doubt that it agreed with the general views of the Frankish Church.[e]

A.D. 767.

Adrian sent the acts of the Nicene council to Charlemagne, no doubt with the expectation that they would be received by the Franks. But the late rupture of the match between his daughter and the son of Irene had not tended to bespeak from the king any favourable consideration of the eastern decrees, and his own convictions were opposed to them. He sent them to Alcuin, who was then in England; and it is said that the English bishops joined in desiring their countryman to write against the council.[f] Alcuin wrote some remarks in the form of a letter, and out of these probably grew a treatise in four books, which was put forth in the name of Charlemagne, and which is known by the title of the Carolinè Books. It is supposed that Alcuin, who returned to France in 793,[g] was the chief author, but that he was assisted by other ecclesiastics, and that Charlemagne himself took part in the revision of the work.[h] The tone of this treatise is firm and dignified.

[d] Mabillon, v. Præf. xxiv.-v.; Döllinger, i. 356-7; Milman, ii. 300-1. Some other reasons which Döllinger gives for the Frankish view appear untenable.

[e] See Einhard, Ann. 767; Spanheim, 778; Basnage, 1357; Walch, xi. 33-5; Schröckh, xix. 566; Gieseler, II. i. 93; Neander, v. 323-3.

[f] Sym. Dunelm. A.D. 792; Rog. Hoveden, ap. Savile, 232, b. Dr. Lingard attempts to explain away their statements. A. S. C. ii. 114-6, and Append. G.

[g] Pagi, xiii. 257.

[h] See Dupin, vi. 146; Mosh. ii. 167; Walch, xi. 66-8; Schröckh, xx. 585-8; Gieseler, II. i. 94; Lorenz, 119; Neander, v. 324-5; Bähr, 346; Gfrörer, iii. 624; Hardwick, 54; Milman, ii. 302. The *Libri Carolini* were first published in 1549 by Jean du Tillet, afterwards bishop of Meaux, who styled himself "Eli. Phili." By *Eli.* was meant Elijah, in allusion to the connexion between that prophet and St. *John* the Baptist, whose name the editor bore; perhaps, too, as Bayle says (Art. *Du Tillet*, note B), Du Tillet may have intended to hint that he was to imitate Elijah's exertions against idolatry. "Phili." was an abbreviation of *Philyra*, the Greek name for the *tilia* or lime-tree. (Schröckh, xx. 584.) Some Romanists have pretended that the book was a forgery of the re-

Although great deference for the apostolic see is professed, the writer resolutely maintains the Frankish view as to images, and unsparingly criticises the grounds alleged for the doctrine held in common by the east and by Rome. The iconoclasts and the council of 754 are blamed for overlooking the distinction between images and idols,[i] but their error is declared to be much less than that of the Nicene synod in confounding the use of images with the worship of them;—the one error is ascribed to ignorance, the other to wickedness.[k] Much is said against the official style of the Byzantine court, which is censured as trenching on the honour due to God.[m] The synod is blamed for having allowed itself to be guided by a woman, contrary to St. Paul's order that women should not be admitted to teach.[n] Its pretension to be œcumenical is denied, on the ground that it neither holds the faith of the universal Church, nor was assembled from all churches.[o] Its claim to Divine sanction is also disallowed.[p] It is said to be madness for one portion of the Church to anathematise other portions in a matter as to which the apostles had not laid down any rule; and much more so when the opinions so branded are agreeable to the earlier councils and Fathers.[q] The passages which had been cited at Nicæa from Scripture and the Fathers are examined, and are cleared from the abuse there made of them.[r] The council is censured for having admitted many stories of a fabulous or apocryphal kind.[s] The account of our Lord's correspondence with Abgarus is questioned;[t] the legend of the monk and the devil of uncleanness is strongly reprobated;[u] doubts are expressed as to the truth of many miraculous tales; and it is argued that, even if the miracles were really wrought by the images, they would not warrant the worship of these.[x] Remarks are made on expressions used by individual bishops at the council.[y] Among these there is the important misrepresentation that Constantius, of Constantia in Cyprus, is charged with having placed the adoration of images on

former Carlstadt; others, that it was written by a heretic of Charlemagne's time, and was sent by the king to Rome in order to be refuted. (See Walch, xi. 51, 61-2; Lorenz, 117-8.) But its genuineness is now acknowledged. See Dupin, vi. 120; Döllinger, i. 358; Bähr, 345.

[i] Præf. ap. Goldast. 92.

[k] Præf. p. 94; Lib. i. 27; iv. 4, p. 473.

[m] L. i. 1-4.

[n] L. iii. 13.

[o] L. iv. 28. This shows that the Franks did not consider the fact of the pope's having presided by his legates, enough to warrant the reception of the council, without the consent of the chief churches. Fleury, xliv. 58.

[p] L. iii. 14.

[q] L. iii. 11-2.

[r] L. i. 5, seqq.; l. ii. 1, seqq.

[s] L. iii. 30.

[t] L. iv. 10.

[u] L. iii. 31.

[x] Lib. iii. 25.

[y] L. iii. 3, seqq., 17, seqq.

the same level with that of the Trinity, and as having anathematised all who thought otherwise; whereas in reality he had distinguished between the devotion paid to images and that which was to be reserved for the Trinity alone.[z] The arguments advanced in behalf of images are discussed and refuted. The honours paid in the east to the statues of emperors had been dwelt on by way of analogy; but it is denied that this is any warrant for the worship of images,—"what madness it is to defend one unlawful thing by another!"—and the conduct of Daniel in Babylon is cited as proving the sinfulness of the eastern practice.[a] It is derogatory to the holy mystery of the eucharist, to the cross—the symbol of our salvation and sign of our Christian profession,—to the consecrated vessels, and to the sacred books, that the veneration paid to these should be paralleled with the worship of images.[b] The reverence due to relics, which had either been part of the bodies of saints or had been connected with them, is no ground for paying a like regard to images, which are the mere work of the artist.[c] Christ and his saints desire no such worship as that in question; and, although the more learned may be able to practise it without idolatry, the unlearned, who have no skill in subtle distinctions, will be drawn to pay really divine worship to that which they see.[d] The guilt of causing offence must rest, not on those who allow images and only refuse worship to them, but on those who force the worship on others.[e] The only proper use of them is by way of ornament, or as historical memorials;[f] it is absurd to say that they represent to us the merits of the saints, since these are not external.[g] And the right use of images for remembrance is strongly distinguished from the plea that it is impossible to remember God without them; those persons must have very faulty memories who need to be reminded by an image—who are unable to raise their minds above the material creation except by the help of a material and created object.[h] The king concludes by declaring to the pope that he adheres to the principles laid down by Gregory the Great in his letters to Serenus of Marseilles,[i] and that he believes this to be the rule of the Catholic Church. Images are to be allowed; the worship of them is not to be enforced; it is forbidden to break or to destroy them.[k]

[z] Comp. L. iii. 17 with Hard. iv. 152.
[a] L. iii. 15.
[b] L. ii. 27-30.
[c] L. iii. 24.
[d] L. iii. 16, fin.
[e] Ibid.
[f] Lib. i. 16.
[g] L. i. 17, pp. 175-6.
[h] Lib. ii. 22.
[i] See above, p. 25.
[k] L. iv. ult.

Adrian replied to the Caroline Books,[m] but feebly, and in a tone which seems to show that he both felt the weakness of his cause, and was afraid to provoke the power of Charlemagne.[n]

It is doubtful whether these communications took place before or after the council which was held under the presidency of Charlemagne, at Frankfort in 794.[o] This council was both a diet of the empire and an ecclesiastical synod. Bishops were assembled from Lombardy and Germany as well as from France; some representatives of the English church, and two legates from Rome, were also present.[p] At the king's suggestion Alcuin was admitted to a place on account of the service which he might be able to render by his learning.[q] The question of images was dealt with by the council in a manner which showed that there was no idea of any right on the part of Rome to prescribe to the Frankish church. The second canon adverts to "the late synod of the Greeks, in which it was said that those should be anathematised who should not bestow service or adoration on the images of the saints even as on the Divine Trinity." In opposition to this, the fathers of Frankfort refuse "both adoration and service of all kinds" to images; they express contempt for the eastern synod, and agree in condemning it.[r] The passage especially censured by this canon is the speech wrongly ascribed in the Caroline Books to the Cyprian metropolitan Constantius, and the misrepresentation is probably to be charged on the imperfect state in which the Nicene acts were presented to the Frankish divines. But, whatever the reason of it may have been, and however the members of the Frankfort council may have misapprehended the opinions of the orientals, there is no ground for arguing from this that they did not understand and plainly state their own judgment on the question.[s]

Notwithstanding the opposition to his views on the subject of images, Adrian continued to cultivate friendly relations with Charlemagne; the political interest which bound Rome to the

[m] His answer is in Hard. iv. 773, seqq.

[n] Neander, v. 335; Milman, ii. 303.

[o] Neander, v. 335. Walch places the council first (xi. 72); Gieseler (II. i. 95-6) and Dean Milman (ii. 303) place it after the exchange of writings.

[p] The whole number of bishops is said to have been about 300; but Walch (ix. 761) says that this number rests on no authority older than Baronius.

[q] Conc. Francof. Can. 56. Hard. iv. 909.

[r] "Contempserunt." Hardouin, iv. 904.

[s] This evasion is attempted by Baronius (794. 36-7) and by Döllinger (i. 357). Elsewhere Baronius argues that the Council of Frankfort could not have really condemned that of Nicæa, *because* whatever it may have determined must have been meant with submission to the Roman see! For other Romish evasions, see Basnage (1368-9) and Giesler, I. ii. 96.

Franks was more powerful than his sympathy with the Greeks as to doctrine. The retention of Calabria and Illyricum, which had been taken from the Roman see by the iconoclastic emperors in the earlier stage of the controversy, alienated the popes more and more from the Byzantine rule, until in 800 the connexion with the east was utterly severed by the coronation of Charlemagne as the sovereign of a new empire of Rome.

III. Before proceeding to the question of images, the council of Frankfort had been occupied with the doctrine of a Spanish bishop, named Felix, on the relation of our Lord's humanity to the Almighty Father. The term *adoption* had been applied to the Incarnation by some earlier writers and in the Spanish Liturgy;[t] it appears, however, not to have been used in its strict sense, but rather as equivalent to *assumption*.[u] The passages which Felix and his party produced from the Fathers as favourable to their view, spoke of an "adoption" of *nature*, of *flesh*, or of *manhood;* whereas they themselves made an important variation from this language by speaking of an adoption of the *Son*.[x]

The Adoptionists were charged by their opponents with Nestorianism, and in spirit the two systems are unquestionably similar. They differed, however, inasmuch as the Adoptionists admitted the doctrine which had been settled as orthodoxy for three centuries and a half. They made no objection to the term *Theotokos*, as applied to the mother of the Saviour's humanity; they allowed the union of natures in Him.[y] But, although they granted the "communication of properties" between the two natures, they insisted on distinguishing the manner in which the predicates of the one nature were given to the other; they regarded it as a confusion of the two natures, and a virtual merging of the humanity, to say that Christ was proper and real Son of God, not only in his Godhead but in his whole person.[z] He cannot, they said, be properly Son of God as to his human nature, unless it be supposed that the humanity and fleshly substance were derived from the very essence of God.[a] The highest thing that can befall humanity is to

[t] See Gieseler, II. i. 111-2. There was a dispute as to a passage in St. Hilary of Poitiers (De Trinitate, ii. 2. p. 34)—"Potestatis dignitas non amittitur dum carnis humilitas *adoptatur*." Alcuin (Adv. Felic. vi. 6) was for reading *adoratur;* but the context seems to show that *adoptatur* is right, and that it is used in the sense of *assumption*. Walch, ix. 897-8; Gieseler, II. i. 112.

[u] Walch, ix. 898-9.

[x] Döllinger, i. 360; Dorner, ii. 317.

[y] Dorner, ii. 307-310.

[z] Walch, ix. 862-4, 891; Dorner, ii. 312.

[a] Felix ap. Alc. i. 12; Dorner, ii. 313.

be adopted into sonship with God; more than this would be a change of nature.[b] Christ's humanity, then, is adopted to sonship; in one sense this adoption existed from the moment of his conception; in another, it began at his baptism, when He passed from the condition of a servant to that of a Son; and it was consummated in his resurrection.[c] He cannot have two fathers in the same nature; in his humanity He is naturally the son of David, and by adoption and grace the Son of God. By nature He is the "only-begotten" Son of God; by adoption and grace the "first-begotten."[d] In the Son of God the Son of man becomes very Son of God; but it is only in a *nuncupative* way.[e] His adoption was likened to that of the saints, although it was said to be after a far more excellent fashion; and his words as to the "*calling* them Gods to whom the word of God came," were cited by way of illustration.[f] The Adoptionists also pressed into their service texts which were in truth meant to set forth the reality of our Lord's manhood, and its inferiority or dependence on his Divinity.[g]

Felix, who has been mentioned as a chief assertor of this doctrine, was bishop of Urgel, in Catalonia, then a part of Charlemagne's dominions. He was a man of great acuteness and learning; his reputation was such that Alcuin sought his correspondence, and, even after the promulgation of his heresy, continued to speak with much respect of his sanctity.[h] His associate Elipand, bishop of Toledo, and primate of Spain under the Mahometan dominion, was far advanced in life when the controversy broke out. He appears to have been a person of violent and excitable temper, and very jealous of his dignity.[i] His style is described as more obscure than that of Felix, and it is therefore inferred that he was more profound.[k]

The early history of the Adoptionist doctrine is unknown. It is probable that Felix was the originator of it, and perhaps he may have been led into it by controversy with his Mahometan neighbours, to whom this view of our Lord's humanity would have been less repulsive than that generally taught by the Church.[m] At least, it appears certain that, whether the author of the doctrine or not,

[b] Dorner, ii. 314.
[c] Walch, 867, 873-8; Neander, v. 223-5; Dorner, ii. 315-8.
[d] Gieseler, II. i. 112-3.
[e] Dorner, i. 312-5; Gieseler, II. i. 113; Walch, 875, 915.
[f] St. Joh. x. 35; Neander, v. 223-4; Dorner, ii. 316-7.
[g] Schröckh, xx. 470-1; Neander, v. 221-2; Dorner, ii. 314.
[h] Alc. Ep. iv., p. 7; Cf. t. i., p. 783; Lorenz, 257.
[i] Walch, ix. 724; Neander, v. 216.
[k] Dorner, ii. 322.
[m] See Alc. Ep. 85; Neander, v. 218-220.

Felix was the person who did most to reduce it to a system.[n] A correspondence took place between him and Elipand; and the primate employed the influence of his position in favour of the new opinion, which soon gained many adherents.[p] The first opponents who appeared against Adoptionism were an abbot named Beatus, and Etherius, bishop of Osma, who had formerly been his pupil. Elipand answered very coarsely; he charged Beatus with profligacy of life, and styled him a false prophet, on account of some speculations as to the fulfilment of the Apocalypse into which he had been led by the oppressed condition of the Spanish church. The primate even carried his intolerance so far as to anathematise all who should presume to differ from him, and to declare that such heretics must be rooted out.[q] Beatus rejoined in a book which in respect of tone would seem to have been worthy of his antagonist; and Elipand again replied.[r] The pope, Adrian, now had his attention drawn to the controversy, and in 785 wrote a letter to the orthodox bishops of Spain, warning them against the new doctrine as an error such as no one since Nestorius had ventured on.[s]

A.D. 783.[o]

This letter, however, failed to appease the differences which had arisen. A council which is said to have been held against the Adoptionists at Narbonne, in 788, is generally regarded as fictitious.[t] But their opinions were condemned by a council at Friuli, under Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, in 791, where it was laid down that the Saviour is "one and the same son of man and Son of God; not putative but real Son of God; not adoptive, but proper; proper and not adoptive in each of his natures, forasmuch as after his assumption of manhood, one and the same person is inconfusibly and inseparably Son of God and of man."[u] In 792, Charlemagne summoned Felix to appear before a council at Ratisbon, where he abjured and anathematised his errors. The king, who presided at the council, appears to have doubted either the sincerity of his new profession, or his steadiness in adhering to it, and therefore sent him to Rome, where he was imprisoned by order of the

[n] Neander, v. 218; Dorner, ii. 306.

[o] Pagi, xiii. 752.

[p] Walch, ix. 743; Schröckh, xx. 461.

[q] Walch, ix. 731-2; Schröckh, xx. 461-2; Neander, v. 226. Felix charges Beatus and Etherius with confounding the Saviour's natures "sicut vinum et aquam." Alcuin, i. 793.

[r] Schröckh, xx. 462-4. This treatise is in Canisius, ii. 297, seqq.; a life of Beatus, in Mabillon, v. 735.

[s] Walch (ix. 747) questions the genuineness of the letter, but, as Schröckh (xx. 466) thinks, on insufficient grounds.

[t] See Walch, ix. 749-751; Schröckh, xx. 466.

[u] Hard. iv. 756.

pope. He obtained his liberty by drawing up an orthodox confession of faith, to which he swore in the most solemn manner, laying it on the consecrated elements and on St. Peter's tomb.[x] But on returning to Urgel, he again vented his heresy, and, in fear of Charlemagne's resentment, he fled into the Mahometan part of Spain.

Alcuin had now been summoned from England to take part in the controversy.[y] Elipand and other Spanish bishops wrote to Charlemagne and to the bishops of France, requesting that Felix might be restored to his see, and that the opinions of Beatus might be suppressed.[z] Charlemagne sent a letter to the pope, who thereupon despatched a second letter into Spain,[a] denouncing the doctrine of the Adoptionists and threatening to excommunicate them if they should persevere in it.

The council of Frankfort was held between the time of Charlemagne's application to Adrian and the receipt of the pope's answer.[b] No representative of the Adoptionist party appeared; but Alcuin argued against their doctrine, and the council in its first canon unanimously condemned it as a heresy which "ought to be utterly rooted out of the church."[c] The Italian bishops adopted a treatise on the question drawn up by Paulinus of Aquileia; and this was sent into Spain, together with a letter from the bishops of Gaul, Aquitaine, and Germany to the Spanish bishops, and with one from Charlemagne to Elipand and his brethren.[d] Alcuin addressed a tract against the Adoptionists to the bishops of the south of France,[e] and also wrote in a respectful tone to Felix himself, urging him to give up the term *adoption*, which he professes to consider as the only point in which Felix varied from the Catholic faith.[f] Felix replied by addressing a defence of his doctrine to Charlemagne, who thereupon desired Alcuin to undertake a formal refutation of the Adoptionists. He answered that time must be allowed him to examine their citations, with the help of his pupils, and begged that the book of Felix might also be referred to the pope, to Paulinus of Aquileia, and to other eminent bishops; if, he said, all should agree in their judgment on the point in question, it might be concluded that they were all guided by the same Holy Spirit.[g]

[x] Conc. Rom. ap. Hard. iv. 928; Einhard, Ann. 792; Walch, ix. 752-4.
[y] Lorenz, 76.
[z] Schröckh, xx. 469-470.
[a] Hard. iv. 865.
[b] Neander, v. 228.
[c] Hard. iv. 904.
[d] The three documents are in Hardouin, iv. 873-903; see Walch, ix. 691, 792.
[e] Alcuin, i. 759-782.
[f] Alcuin, i. 784.
[g] Ep. 69; Lorenz, 132. Hence it is evident that Alcuin had no idea of *papal* infallibility. Neander, v. 231.

Alcuin then produced a treatise in seven books—"these five loaves and two little fishes," as he styles them.[h] The great argument on which he relies is the unity of the Saviour's person. Although Felix had not ventured to deny this, it is urged that in consistency he must do so, like Nestorius, since he divides Christ into two sons, the one real, the other nuncupative.[i] The same person cannot be at once the proper and the adopted son of the same father; Christ alone has by nature that which we have through Him by adoption and grace.[k] The Sonship is not founded on the nature, but on the person; the two natures do not form two sons, since they are themselves not separate, but inseparably united in the one Christ; the whole Christ is Son of God and Son of man: there is no room for an adoptive sonship.[m] Christ was very God from the moment of his human conception.[n] Felix, it is said, had erred through supposing that a son cannot be *proper* unless he be of the same nature with the father; whereas the term *proper* does not necessarily imply identity of substance between that which is so styled and that to which it is ascribed: thus we speak of "proper names" and "proper [i. e. own] possessions."[o] A man is the proper son of his parents both in body and in soul, although the body only be of their seed; and in like manner Christ in his whole person, in manhood as well as in Godhead, is proper Son of God.[p] But the whole matter, being supernatural, cannot be fitly measured by human analogies. Christ is Son of God the Father, although his flesh be not generated of God; and to deny the possibility of this is to impugn the Divine omnipotence.[q]

In the meantime Leidrad, archbishop of Lyons, Nefridius, bishop of Narbonne, and Benedict, abbot of Aniane, were sent into the district in which Felix had spread his opinions. They laboured with much success in confutation of Adoptionism, and, having met Felix himself at Urgel, they persuaded him, by an assurance of safety, to proceed into France, in order that he might answer for himself before a council, which was to be held at Aix-la-Chapelle.[r] A council at Rome, under Leo III., had just pro-

[h] Opera, i. 788.

[i] Lib. i. 11; iv. 5; Dorner, ii. 325. Walch argues that the Adoptionists were orthodox, since they did not say that Christ in his twofold sonship was *alius et alius*, but that He was son *aliter et aliter*. (ix. 881-4.) But—not to go into any deeper argument—how is the fury of Elipand against the doctrine of the church to be accounted for, if his own doctrine were the same?

[k] ii. 12; iii. 2; Dorner, ii. 325.

[m] Döllinger, i. 361; Cf. Paulinus, sup., p. 156.

[n] iv. 8-10.

[o] v. 3; Dorner, ii. 325.

[p] iii. 2; v. 3; Dorner, ii. 324.

[q] i. 9; iii. 2.

[r] Pagi, xiii. 350; Schröckh, xx. 487-8.

nounced a fresh condemnation against him, but with so little knowledge of the matter as to accuse him of denying that the Saviour had any other than a nuncupative Godhead.[s] At Aix, A.D. 799. Felix was confronted by Alcuin, who had been drawn from his retirement at Tours for the purpose. The discussion lasted for six days, and Felix at length professed to be convinced by some passages from the Fathers (especially Cyril of Alexandria, Leo, and Gregory the Great) which had not before been known to him. He retracted his errors, condemned Nestorius, and exhorted his clergy and people to follow the true faith.[t] As, however, his former changes suggested a suspicion of his constancy, he was committed to the care of the archbishop of Lyons. Leidrad and his brother commissioners went again into Catalonia for the purpose of rooting out the heresy; and it is said by Alcuin that, during their two visits, they made twenty thousand converts—bishops, clergy, and laity.[u]

Elipand, not being a subject of Charlemagne, was more difficult to deal with than his associate. He now entered into controversy with Alcuin, whom he treated with his usual rudeness, reproaching him as the chief persecutor of Felix, and taxing him (among other things) with having 20,000 slaves, and with being proud of his wealth.[x] Alcuin replied in four books, and the death of Elipand followed soon after. It has been said that at last he renounced his heresy,[y] but the story appears improbable. Felix remained at Lyons with Leidrad, and afterwards with his successor Agobard. He occasionally vented some of his old opinions, but, when Agobard argued with him, he professed to be convinced. After his death, however, which took place in 818, it was found that he had left a paper containing the chief points of his heresy in the form of question and answer; and Agobard found himself obliged to undertake a refutation of this, in order to counteract the mischief which it was likely to produce, as coming from a person who had been much revered for sanctity.[z] Although the Adoptionist doc-

[s] Hard. iv. 928.

[t] Alcuin, Epp. 92, 176; Vit. Alc. 7; Hard. iv. 929-934.

[u] Ep. xcii., p. 130; Comp. Walch, ix. 776.

[x] Alcuin, i. 869. The slaves are supposed to have been those attached to the estates belonging to St. Martin's Abbey and to Alcuin's other preferments. The address of the letter may be quoted as a specimen of the Spanish primate's style: —"Reverendissimo fratri Albino diacono, non Christi ministro, sed antiphrasii Beati fœtidissimo discipulo, novo Arrio, sanctorum venerabilium patrum Ambrosii, Augustini, Isidori, Hieronymi, doctrinis contrario—si se converterit ab errore viæ suæ, a Domino æternam salutem; et si noluerit, æternam damnationem." Ap. Alcuin. i. 868.

[y] Vita Beati ap. Mabillon, v. 737; Mariana, v. 67.

[z] Agob. adv. Felicem, 1-6.

trine has been revived or justified by some writers of later times, it never afterwards gained any considerable influence.[a]

IV. Towards the end of Charlemagne's reign a controversy arose as to the Procession of the Holy Spirit. In the Latin Church it had always been held that the Third Person of the Godhead proceeds from the Second as well as from the First.[b] The same doctrine which the Latins thus expressed—that the Godhead of the Holy Spirit is communicated from the Son as well as from the Father—had also been held by the Greeks in general; but, as the word *proceed* is in Scripture used only of his relation to the Father,[c] they had not applied it to express his relation to the Son.[d] Thus the second General Council, in the words which it added to the Nicene creed in opposition to the Macedonian heresy, defined only that the Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father." Theodoret, indeed, had used language which seems irreconcilable with the western belief;[e] but it is not to be understood as expressing more than the private opinion of a writer whose orthodoxy was not unimpeached on other points; and as yet no controversy either of fact or of expression had arisen as to this subject between the two great divisions of the Church.

In the west, the procession of the Spirit from the Son was in time introduced into creeds. It is found in the Athanasian Creed, a form which was undoubtedly of western composition, but of which the date is much disputed.[f] The first appearance of the

[a] Schröckh, xx. 494; Gieseler, II. i. 117.

[b] See quotations from Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, and Leo the Great, in Pearson on the Creed, ii. 430-1, ed. Burton, Oxf. 1833; Gieseler, II. i. 107.

[c] St. John, xv. 26.

[d] Pearson, ii. 432-3; Schröckh, xx. 499.

[e] See Pearson, ii. 434; Schröckh, xx. 501.

[f] A table of the different opinions as to its date and authorship is given by Waterland, iii. 117, ed. 1843. Gerard Vossius once thought that it was the work of a Frenchman, in the reign of Pipin or of Charlemagne, but afterwards modified his opinion so far as to say that the Creed was not older than A.D. 600 (ib. 108). Quesnel ascribed it to Vigilius of Tapsus (A.D. 484), and has been followed by many (ib. 111). Waterland himself (ib. 213-9) supposes it the work of Hilary of Arles, composed after his elevation to the bishoprick (A.D. 429), and in consequence of the retractation of Leporius (see vol. i. p. 397). Gieseler, in his posthumous Lectures on the History of Doctrines (vi. 325), says that it is probably of the sixth century; but in another passage (which may have been composed or revised later than the Lectures, although it was published during his lifetime) he refers it to the seventh or eighth century, and says that the testimonies alleged for it before the latter part of the eighth are very uncertain. He considers the name *Fides Athanasii* to be intended as the opposite of *Fides Arii*, and infers that the Creed was composed in Spain, the country where Arianism kept the longest hold (II. i. 109-110). The latest writer on the subject, Mr. Harvey, thinks that it was probably made by Victricius, bishop of Rouen, in defending himself against a charge of heresy, A.D. 401. ('The Three Creeds,' 584 seqq., Camb. 1854.) The proof of this does not appear very convincing.

doctrine in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan creed was at the third council of Toledo, in 589;[g] and it was often enforced by later Spanish councils, under the sanction of an anathema.[h] It would seem to have been from Spain that the definition made its way into France, where the truth of the double procession was not disputed, but some questions were raised as to the expediency or the lawfulness of adding to the Nicene Creed.[i]

The origin of the differences on this subject in the period now before us is not clear.[k] There was some discussion of it at the council of Gentilly, where the ambassadors of Constantine Copronymus were present;[l] but (as has been already stated[m]) the details of that council are unknown. At the council of Friuli, in 791, Paulinus maintained the expediency of the definition, "on account of those heretics who whisper that the Holy Spirit is of the Father alone, and proceedeth from the Father alone;" he defended it against the charge of novelty, as being not an addition to the Nicene Creed, but an explanation of it;[n] and the council adopted a profession of faith in which the Double Procession was laid down.[o] A.D. 767.

The matter came in a more pressing form before a council held at Aix in 809, when a complaint was made that one John, a monk of St. Sabas, had attacked the Frankish monks and pilgrims at Jerusalem on account of this doctrine, and had attempted to drive them away by force.[p] The council approved of the addition to the creed,[q] and Charlemagne sent two bishops and an abbot to Rome with a request that the pope would confirm the judgment. Leo, at a conference with the envoys, of which a curious account is preserved,[r] expressed his agreement in the doctrine of the Double Procession, but decidedly opposed the insertion of the words into the creed. It would, he said, be wrong to insert the doctrine, since a council guided by wisdom from above had omitted it; and, moreover, the point was one of those which are not necessary to salvation for the mass of ordinary Christians. It is said that he put up in St. Peter's two silver shields engraved with the creed of Constantinople in Greek and in Latin, and that on both the words.

[g] Hard. iii. 472.
[h] Schröckh, xx. 503-4; Gieseler, II. i. 107.
[i] Gieseler, II. i. 108-9.
[k] Ib.
[l] Einhard, ann. 767.
[m] Page 150.
[n] Hard. iv. 850.
[o] Ib. 855.
[p] Einhard, ann. 809; Schröckh, xx. 509.
[q] Baronius says that the question at Aix did not relate to doctrine, but solely to the addition of *Filioque* in the Creed (809-53). Pagi argues against him (xiii. 455-6). Comp. Mosheim, ii. 167, and Schröckh, xx. 506.
[r] Hard. iv. 969-973.

"and from the Son" were omitted. But, in order that there might be no doubt as to his opinion on the question of doctrine, he sent into the east a confession of faith in which the procession of the Spirit from the Son was twice distinctly affirmed.[8] We hear no more of the difference between the Eastern and Western Churches on this subject until at a later time it was revived and led to important consequences.

It may be difficult to follow, and impossible to read with interest, the history of such controversies as those on Monothelism and Adoptionism; and the Church has often been reproached with the agitation into which it was thrown by questions which never enter into the consideration of the great body of Christian believers. We ought, however, to remember that an error which is to agitate the Church internally must not begin by setting at nought the decisions of former times; the spirit of speculation must fix on some point which is apparently within the limits already prescribed for orthodoxy. Hence, in the controversies which relate to the highest Christian doctrines, the ground is continually narrowed, as we proceed from Arianism to Nestorianism and Eutychianism, and from these to the errors which have lately come before us; while each question, as it arose, required to be discussed and decided by the lights of Scripture and of the judgments which had been before pronounced. It is not, therefore, the Church that deserves to be blamed, if the opinions against which its solemn condemnations were directed became successively more and more subtle; and the reader must be content to bear with the writer, if their path should sometimes lie through intricacies which both must feel to be uninviting and wearisome.

[8] Pagi, xiii. 457; Schröckh, xx. 511; Gieseler, II. i. 109.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORIENTAL SECTS.

I. It has been mentioned, in the sketch of the Mahometan conquests, that the Arabs took advantage of the enmity between the Catholics and the Jacobites (or Monophysites) to enlist the depressed and persecuted sectaries on their side.[a] For the services thus rendered, the Jacobites were repaid by a superior degree of favour from their new masters when Egypt and Syria had fallen under the rule of the caliphs. Many of those whom the measures of Heraclius had driven to profess catholicism now returned to the open avowal of their old opinions; and the Church lost, not only by the progress of the sword and doctrines of Islam, but by the defection of many of its own members to the heretical Christianity.

The Jacobites continued to be strong in Egypt, and also in the more westerly countries of Asia, where they were now under the government of a patriarch resident at Amida. But the party had been extirpated in Persia,[b] and it made no further progress towards the east.[c]

II. The history of the Nestorians during this period was more remarkable. They, like the opposite sect, were at first courted and afterwards favoured by the Musulmans on account of their hostility to the catholics. At their head stood a bishop known by the title of *Catholic* or *Patriarch of Babylon*; his residence was originally at Seleucia or Ctesiphon,[d] but on the foundation of Bagdad by Almansur, in 762, he removed his seat to that city.[e] In the eighth century, the Nestorians got a footing in Egypt;[f] and in the east they laboured with great activity to propagate their form of Christianity, without, apparently, any rivalry on the part of the Catholics. Following the course of trade, Nestorian missionaries made their way by sea from India to China, while others penetrated across the deserts to its northern frontier.[g] A stone discovered by the Jesuits near Singanfoo, in 1625, bears a long inscription, partly

[a] P. 36.
[b] See vol. i. p. 493.
[c] Schröckh, xx. 378.
[d] From A.D. 498. Wiltsch, i. 216.
[e] Pagi, xiii. 6; Wiltsch, i. 451.
[f] Schröckh, xx. 377.
[g] Mosheim. Hist. Tartarorum Ecclesiastica. 12.

Syriac and partly Chinese, recording the names of missionaries who had laboured in China, and the history of Christianity in that country from the year 636 to 781. Its fortunes had been varied by success and persecution; but in the eighth century it had usually enjoyed great favour from the emperors, and many churches had been built. With these details the inscription contains a summary of Christian doctrine and practice, in which a tinge of Nestorianism is discernible.[h]

The patriarch Timothy, who held his office from 777 to 820, reduced the Nestorian metropolitan of Persia to subjection, and was especially active in organizing missions.[i] By the preachers whom he sent out, a knowledge of Christianity was spread in Hyrcania, Tartary, Bactria, and other countries of central Asia, where it long retained a hold. Bishops and metropolitans, owning allegiance to the patriarch of Babylon, were established in those vast regions, and with a view to this a singular ritual provision was made by Timothy—that, if no more than two bishops could be procured for the consecration of a brother, the canonical number should be made up by allowing a book of the Gospels to supply the place of the third.[k]

III. The tenets and character of the Paulicians have been the subject of controversy, which has been too often largely influenced by the party interests of those who have shared in it. Writers of the Roman Church have professed to discover in the Paulicians the ancestors of the protestant reformers, and have transferred to these the charges of Manichæism which are brought against the ancient sect.[m] On the other hand, some protestants have ventured to accept the pedigree, and, with a confidence which equally disdains facts and reason, have asserted that the Paulicians were guiltless of the heresies imputed to them—that they were the maintainers of what these writers suppose to be a purely scriptural Christianity.[n]

[h] Mosheim, Hist. Tartar. Eccl. Append. 4-28, gives a copy of the inscription after Kircher. The genuineness of this record has been disputed, but seems to be now commonly, although not universally, admitted. Of the arguments I know only that it is said to contain things which the Jesuits *could* not have forged; and that, if the Jesuits had ventured on a forgery, they would have made it more favourable to their own views. As to the fact of Christianity in China, there is sufficient testimony of other kinds. See Mosh. ii. 62, and Hist. Tartar. 9-13; Schröckh, xix. 293-6; Gieseler, I. ii. 437; Gibbon, iv. 378, and Dean Milman's notes.

[i] Schröckh, xx. 376.

[k] Mosh. Hist. Tart. 115; Schröckh, xix. 297; Gibbon, iv. 377; Neander, v. 123.

[m] See Rader, in the verses prefixed to his translation of Petr. Siculus; Baron. 810. 7.

[n] Some letters by the Rev. G. S. Faber, in vols. xiv.-xv. of the 'British Magazine,' may be mentioned as examples of this class. Neander, not being

It would be useless to enter here into a discussion of these rival extravagances.

It is agreed that the word *Paulician* is a barbarous formation from the name *Paul*. But there is a question as to the person from whom the designation was taken. Some trace it to one Paul of Samosata—not the notorious bishop of Antioch, in the third century, but a Manichæan of later, although uncertain, date;[o] others to an Armenian who was eminent in the sect about the time of Justinian II.[p] But the most probable supposition appears to be that it is derived from the name of the great Apostle, whom the Paulicians affected especially to regard as their master.[q]

Gnosticism, banished from other parts of the empire, had taken refuge in the countries bordering on the Euphrates, where, in course of time, the remnants of its various parties had come to be confounded under the general name of Manichæans.[r] In this region, at the village of Mananalis, near Samosata, lived about the year 653 one Constantine, who is described as descended from a Manichæan family.[s] A deacon, who was returning from captivity among the Saracens, became his guest, and, in acknowledgment of his hospitality, left with him a manuscript containing the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles. Constantine read these, applying the principles of his old belief to the interpretation of them; and the result was, that he renounced some of the grosser

hampered by the same doctrinal scruples as the English patrons of the sect, is able to take a somewhat bolder view; he traces the Paulicians to his favourite Marcion (see vol. i. p. 43), and acknowledges their Gnosticism and Dualism, while he holds that under these forms they apprehended a spiritual Christianity, derived from St. Paul and St. John! (v. 342). The chief sources of information as to the sect are Photius, in the 1st of his four books, 'Against the Manichæans,' published in Wolf's 'Anecdota Græca,' vols. i.-ii. Hamburg, 1722; and Petrus Siculus, whose tract was published, with a bad Latin translation by Rader, a Jesuit, at Ingoldstadt, in 1604, and has been reprinted, with a new translation, by Gieseler (Göttingen, (1846). The two works have much in common, the authors having probably used the same materials; but it is supposed that Photius wrote first, and that his treatise was known to Peter. (Gieseler, Præf. vi.-viii.) See Wolf. Præf. ad Phot.; Mosh. ii. 253, notes; Schröckh, xx. 365; Dowling's Letter to Maitland on the Paulicians. Lond. 1835, p. 32. Gfrörer, ii. 224.

[o] See Phot. l. i. c. 2.; Pet. Sic. 50-8, ed. Rader; Cedren. 432.

[p] See Phot. i. 18.

[q] This is the opinion of Gibbon (v. 274), Döllinger (i. 343); Hallam (Mid. Ages, ii. 439); and Neander (v. 340-1). Gieseler (II. i. 15) says that, when the sect had styled itself after the apostle, its enemies referred the name to one of the other Pauls as its founder. Mr. Dowling, on the contrary, thinks that it first got its name from one of the others, and then affected to explain it by a reference to St. Paul. He admits that there is no real connexion with the Samosatenian, and would therefore derive the name from the Armenian Paul. Guericke (ii 83) well remarks that, when the sect had called itself after the apostle, the frequent recurrence of the name Paul among its members is easily understood. See too Gfrörer, ii. 201.

[r] Gibbon, v. 272.

[s] Pet. Sic. 40-2: Pagi, xi. 459.

absurdities in which he had been trained, burnt the heretical books which it was a capital crime to possess, and put forth a system which, by means of allegorical and other evasions, he professed to reconcile with the letter of the New Testament, while in reality it was mainly derived from the doctrines of his former sect.[t] Although he is usually styled a Manichæan, it would appear that the term is not to be strictly understood. His opinions appear to have been more akin to Marcionism, which is known to have been strong in the region of the Euphrates two hundred years earlier,[u] and his followers freely anathematised Manes, among other heresiarchs.[x]

Constantine styled himself Silvanus, and the leaders who succeeded him assumed the names of Titus, Epaphroditus, Timothy, and others of St. Paul's companions.[y] In like manner they affected to transfer to the chief communities of their sect the names of churches in which the apostle and his associates had laboured.[z] The Paulicians acknowledged his epistles, with those of St. James, St. John, St. Jude, and the Acts. They also originally admitted the four Gospels, although it would seem that they afterwards rested exclusively on those of St. Luke and St. John, if they did not absolutely reject the others.[a] They rejected the Old Testament, and they especially denounced St. Peter, as a betrayer of his Lord and of the truth—nor was their enmity without reason, says Peter of Sicily, since the apostle had prophesied against their misuse of St. Paul.[b]

The Paulicians held that matter was eternal; that there were two gods—the one, generated of darkness and fire, the creator and lord of the present world, the God of the Old Testament and of the Church; the other, the Supreme, the object of their own worship, the God of the spiritual world which is to come.[c] They held that the soul of man was of heavenly origin, imprisoned in a material body.[d] They not only refused to the Blessed Virgin the excessive honours which the Catholics had gradually bestowed on her, but are said to have altogether disparaged her; they denied her perpetual virginity, while they maintained that our Lord did

[t] Pet. Sic. 40-2; Phot. i. 3, 16.

[u] Mosh. ii. 251; Schröckh, xx. 370; Neander, v. 337; Gieseler, II. i. 14.

[x] Phot. i. 4, 16; Pet. Sic. 62.

[y] Phot. i. 4. It is said that Constantine pretended to be the *same* with St. Paul's Silvanus (Phot. i. 16; Pet. Sic. 44); but this is unlikely.

[z] Phot. i. 5.

[a] See Pet. Sic. 18, with the marginal note by a later writer; Phot. i. 8; Neander, v. 370.

[b] Pet. Sic. 20; Phot. i. 8. The charge of betraying the truth had reference to Gal. ii. 11, seqq.

[c] Pet. Sic. 16-8; Phot. i. 6.

[d] Neander, v. 358-9; Döllinger, i. 345.

not really take of her substance, but that He brought his body from heaven, and that his birth was only in appearance.[e] They objected to the order of presbyters, because the Jewish presbyters or elders had opposed the Christ;[f] their own teachers were not distinguished by any special character, dress, manner of life, or privileges. Of these teachers several grades are mentioned, but they did not form a permanent hierarchy; thus, when the "companions in travel,"[g] who had been associated with the last great master of the sect died out, the *notaries*, whose business it was to copy the writings which were acknowledged as authoritative, became its chief instructors.[h] The Paulicians reverenced Constantine and three others of their leaders as apostles or prophets.[i] They rejected the sacraments: Christ, they said, did not give his disciples bread and wine, but by the names of these elements He signified his own sustaining words.[k] The true baptism is He himself, who declared Himself to be the "living water."[m] They spat on the cross and attacked the catholics on account of their reverence for images.[n] They allowed themselves a great license of equivocation as to their opinions; and in the same spirit they did not scruple to attend the catholic worship or sacraments.[o] They claimed for themselves exclusively the title of Christians, and styled the Catholics *Romans*, as having merely a political religion.[p] Their own places of worship were not styled temples or churches, but *proseuchæ*—houses of prayer.[q] By the modern patrons of the Paulicians, their opposition in some of these points to the current errors or superstitions of the time has been traced to an unbiassed study of Holy Scripture; but it may be more truly

[e] Phot. i. 7; Pet. Sic. 16.

[f] Phot. i. 9.

[g] συνέδημοι—from Acts xix. 29; 2 Cor. viii. 19.

[h] Pet. Sic. 72; Neander, v. 365; Dowling, 19.

[i] Pet. Sic. 42.

[k] τὴν θείαν καὶ φρικτὴν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος . . . . μεταλήψιν ἀποτρέψαι. (Pet. Sic. 18.) Rader renders the last words *contrectationem*—as if a denial of transubstantiation were regarded by the Greek Church of the ninth century as a mark of heresy. But the real meaning—that the Paulicians *refused to partake* of the sacramental elements ("perceptionem recusant"—Gieseler)—is clear from another passage (p. 56), where a member of the sect is asked διὰ τί οὐ μεταλαμβάνεις;

[m] Photius (i. 9) says that they allowed themselves to be baptised by clergy who were captive among them, although they supposed the effects to be profitable only to the body. Neander (v. 363) gives an improbable explanation of the statement. We may, perhaps, rather understand that in this, as in other things, they showed a pretended conformity to the usages of the church, and mocked at baptism as a mere cleansing of the flesh. See Cedrenus, 435, quoted by Dowling, 20.

[n] Phot. i. 7. See John of Oznun, patriarch of Armenia, A.D. 718-729, in Neander, v. 345; Gieseler, II. i. 13.

[o] Phot. i. 6-9; Cedren. 435.

[p] Phot. i. 6.

[q] Gieseler, I. ii. 16.

explained by their connexion with older sects, which had become separate before the corruptions in question were introduced into the Church itself.

Constantine fixed himself at Cibossa, in Armenia, where he presided over his sect for twenty-seven years, and made many converts, both from the Church and from the Zoroastrian religion.[r] At length the matter was reported to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, who sent an officer named Symeon to Cibossa, with orders to put the heresiarch to death, and to distribute his followers among the clergy and in monasteries, with a view to their being reclaimed.[s] Symeon carried off Constantine and a large body of the sectaries, whom he drew up in a line, and commanded to stone their chief. Instead of obeying, all but one let fall the stones with which they were armed; but Constantine was killed, like another Goliah (as we are told), by a stone from the hand of a youth—his own adopted son Justus.[t] As the sectaries proved obstinate in their errors, Symeon entered into conference with some of them; the effect was, that, being ignorant as to the grounds of his old religion, he became their convert, and, after spending three years at Constantinople in great uneasiness of mind, he fled, leaving all his property behind him, and took up his abode at Cibossa, where, under the name of Titus, he became the successor of Constantine.[u] After a time, Justus was struck by the seeming inconsistency of the Paulician doctrines with a text[x] which refers the spiritual as well as the material world to the same one Creator. He proposed the difficulty to Symeon, expressing a fear that they might both have been in error, and might have misled their followers; and, on finding that Symeon would not satisfy him, he went to the bishop of a neighbouring town, Colonia (now Calahissar), and exposed the tenets of the sect. The bishop reported the case to the emperor, Justinian II., and, in consequence, Symeon, Justus, and many of their followers, were burnt to death on one large pile.[y]

A.D. 684.

About A.D. 690.

Among those who escaped this fate was an Armenian named Paul,[z] who took up his abode near Phanaroea, at a place which is said to have derived its name, Episparis, from the sowing of

[r] Pet. Sic. 44.
[s] Pet. Sic. 49.
[t] Phot. i. 16; Pet. Sic. 44.
[u] Phot. i. 16; Pet. Sic. 46.
[x] Coloss. i. 16.
[y] Phot. i. 17; Pet. Sic. 46-50.
[z] Pet. Sic. 48, says that some derived the name of the sect from this Paul. Mr. Dowling, as has been said above, agrees with them.

spiritual tares there by the elder Paul, the Samosatenian. The sect revived under Paul, but at his death the headship of it was contested by his two sons. The elder, Gegnæsius, to whom his father had given the name of Timothy, rested his claims on hereditary succession; the younger, Theodore, relied on an immediate commission from heaven.[a] The dispute reached the ears of Leo the Isaurian, who ordered Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, to examine Gegnæsius. The Paulician was skilful enough to satisfy all questions. He anathematised all who denied the orthodox faith, for by that name he secretly meant his own heresy. He anathematised all who refused to worship the cross, for by the cross he meant our Lord himself stretching out his arms in prayer or benediction. He anathematised all who refused worship to the Theotokos, into whom the Saviour entered—understanding under this description the heavenly Jerusalem, into which Christ has entered as the forerunner of his elect. By the Catholic Church, he meant his own sect; by baptism, Christ, the "living water;" by the body and blood of Christ, the Saviour's words of instruction. He therefore anathematised all who rejected any of these, and, having satisfied Germanus, he was sent home with favourable letters from the emperor.[b]

A.D. 715.

A.D. 722.

The abhorrence which the Paulicians professed for images might have been supposed likely to recommend the sect to the iconoclastic emperors. But it would seem that these princes rather feared to connect themselves with the disrepute which its other opinions had brought on it;[c] and thus we find that Leo and his son, instead of favouring the Paulicians, transported many of them from Armenia into Thrace.[d] After various fortunes, the headship of the sect had fallen to one Baanes,[e] who is styled "the filthy," and may therefore be probably supposed to have sanctioned some of the immoralities which are too often lightly imputed to all heresiarchs.[f] But when the Paulicians had sunk thus low, a reformer appeared in the person of a young man named Sergius.

Sergius was converted to Paulicianism by a female theologian. The historians of the sect relate that this woman, having fixed on him as one whom it was desirable to gain, entered into conversation with him, and, after some compliments on his learning and character, asked him why he did not read the Scriptures. He

[a] Phot. i. 18; Pet. Sic. 48.
[b] Phot. i. 18; Pet. Sic. 50.
[c] Giesceler, II. i. 16.
[d] Theophan. 662.
[e] Pet. Sic. 54; Phot. i. 20.
[f] The Paulicians are charged by Photius with promiscuous incest, &c. i. 10.

answered that such studies were not lawful for Christians in general, but only for the clergy—an idea which Chrysostom had strongly opposed,[g] but which since his time had become fixed in the popular belief, although without any formal authority from the Church. "It is not as you think," she rejoined; "for there is no acceptance of persons with God, since He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." And she went on to tell him that the clergy mutilated and corrupted the word of God, and that such of them as did miracles would be found among those to whom Christ will say in the judgment-day, "I never knew you." Sergius began to read the Scriptures, and, under the tuition of his instructress, he learnt to apply to the Catholics all that is there said against the fleshly Israel, and to regard the Paulicians as the true spiritual Church of Christ.[h] He assumed the name of Tychicus,[i] and became a new founder of the sect, which is said to have held his writings in equal veneration with the Scriptures themselves.[k] His own morals would seem to have been unimpeachable, since Photius and Peter of Sicily can only charge him with hypocrisy;[m] and he reformed the morality of the Paulicians, in opposition to the principles of Baanes. This led to a separation of the sect into two hostile branches; and, after the death of Sergius, his followers, wishing to clear themselves from the obloquy attached to the Baanites, fell on them, and carried on a bloody contest with them.[n]

A.D. 801.

A.D. 801-835.

For thirty-four years—from the reign of Irene to that of Theophilus—Sergius laboured indefatigably in the cause of Paulicianism. He is said to have indulged in unseemly boasting of his success; to have preferred himself to the earlier teachers of the party; to have styled himself the *resplendent lamp*, the *shining light*, the *life-giving star*, and even the *Paraclete*.[o]

The emperor Nicephorus was friendly to the sect, and granted it toleration in Phrygia and Lycaonia. Theophanes tells us that he engaged in magical practices with "the Manichæans who are called Paulicians," in order to obtain victory for his arms.[p] Under Michael Rhangabe severe laws were enacted against these

[g] See Gieseler, II. i. 15.
[h] Phot. i. 20; Pet. Sic. 56-8.
[i] Pet. Sic. 54.
[k] Pet. Sic. 18.
[m] Pet. Sic. 60; Phot. i. 21.
[n] Phot. i. 22; Pet. Sic. i. 221.
[o] Phot. i. 21; Pet. Sic. 62. We have already had instances of assuming this last title, in Montanus, Manes, and Mahomet (i. 71, 126; ii. 33). That Sergius cannot have meant to identify himself with the Holy Spirit appears from the fact that he placed himself lower than St. Paul. Neander, v. 350.
[p] Theophan. 759; Schröckh, xxiii. 319; Neander, v. 351

heretics. Those who should be obstinate in their errors were to be put to death. A party in the church, headed by Theodore the Studite, opposed the infliction of death as the punishment of heresy;[q] but Theophanes argues that this view is absurd, since St. Peter inflicted death on Ananias and Sapphira, and St. Paul says that persons who are guilty of certain sins are worthy of death.[r] To these Scriptural authorities for persecution Peter of Sicily adds another—the command, "Those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me."[s]

Leo the Armenian, iconoclast as he was, continued the persecution of the Paulicians. The sectaries, as usually happens, were exasperated by such treatment. The deaths of some of their chiefs were avenged by the slaughter of a prefect and of a bishop who had been active against them.[t] They lived in constant hostility to their neighbours, and, as opportunity favoured, they broke out from their bounds, devastated, plundered, and slaughtered; their female captives, it is said, were given up to promiscuous lust; the children were either killed or sold to the Saracens; and Sergius found himself unable to restrain the excesses of his followers.[u] Sergius himself was slain with his own axe by a man who had found him cutting wood, in the year 835.[x] A.D. 813-820.

After the re-establishment of images, under the regency of Theodora,[y] the empress was urged by the victorious party to undertake the suppression of Paulicianism, whether by conversion or by force. The sectaries resisted all attempts which were made to gain them, and the fury of persecution was let loose among them. It is said that not less than 100,000 were slain by the sword, beheaded, drowned, or impaled.[z] Among the victims was the father of Carbeas, captain of the guard to the prefect of the east. Carbeas, on hearing of his parent's fate, renounced his allegiance to the empire, and, with 5000 companions, sought a refuge among the Saracens. The caliph gladly welcomed the fugitives, and granted them leave to settle within his territory, where, on the same principle by which they had justified their occasional conformity to the church, they adopted externally the rites of Islam.[a] Carbeas built or enlarged and fortified several A.D. 844.

[q] Ep. ii. 155 (quoted by Neander, v. 352); Schröckh, xxiii. 319.
[r] Rom. i. 32; Theophan. 771.
[s] St. Luke xix. 27; Pet. Sic. 68.
[t] Pet. Sic. 71; Phot. i. 24.
[u] Pet. Sic. 62.
[x] Pet. Sic. 71; Phot. i. 24.
[y] A.D. 842.
[z] Cedren. 541; Schlosser, 557-560.
[a] Phot. i. 26.

towns, of which Tephrica was the chief and became the head-quarters of the sect.[b] By his management the Baanites and the Sergians were reconciled;[c] Paulicians from other quarters flocked to the new home which was opened for them; and the numbers of the party were swelled by refugees who sought an asylum from the imperial laws, and, according to its enemies, by others who found an attraction in the license of morals which it granted to its members.[d] The Paulicians harassed their neighbours of the empire by continual aggressions.[e] Under the command of Carbeas, their forces, in conjunction with the Saracens, gained a great victory over Michael, the son of Theodora, under the walls of Samosata;[f] and in the reign of the next emperor, Basil, Chrysocheir, the son-in-law of Carbeas,[g] advanced through Asia Minor with an army made up of Paulicians and Saracens, pillaged Ancyra, Nicæa, Nicomedia, and other cities, gave up images and relics to his followers for profanation, and stabled his horses in the cathedral of Ephesus. Basil was reduced to sue for peace; but Chrysocheir refused it except on the intolerable condition that he should give up the east to "the servants of the Lord."[h] The emperor had no choice but to carry on the war; he advanced into the Paulician country, and took some of the towns, but was obliged to relinquish the siege of Tephrica.[i] Chrysocheir again invaded the imperial territory; but his troops were defeated by one of Basil's generals, and he himself, as he fled, was wounded with a lance and thrown from his horse by one Pylades who had formerly been his captive. He reminded Pylades of the kindness with which he had treated him; but some other Greeks came to the spot, who killed Chrysocheir, cut off his head, and carried it to the emperor, who gratified his enmity by piercing it with three arrows.[k]

A.D. 867.

A.D. 871.

After the death of Chrysocheir, the Paulicians ceased to be formidable. Tephrica was destroyed, yet a remnant of the sect continued to assert its independence for a century later.[m] In another quarter, the heresy had been kept up by the descendants of those who were transported into Thrace by Constantine Copronymus.[n] It was in order to guard the newly-founded church of Bulgaria

[b] Cedren. 541.
[c] Giesel., II. i. 19.
[d] Pet. Sic. 73.
[e] Cedren. 542.
[f] Phot. i. 26; Cedren. 545; Gibbon, v. 279.
[g] Phot. i. 28.
[h] Gibbon, v. 280.
[i] Ibid.
[k] Cedren. 570-3; Gibbon, v. 280
[m] Gibbon, v. 281.
[n] Ibid.

from the infection of its Thracian neighbours that Peter of Sicily, about the year 870, addressed to the Archbishop of the Bulgarians the tract which is a chief source of information as to the sect, drawing his materials in part from the observations and inquiries which he had made during a residence of nine months at Tephrica, on a mission for negotiating an exchange of prisoners.[o]

[o] Pet. Sic. 2, 74. On the date, see Pagi, xv. 230; Gieseler, Præf. iii.-iv.

CHAPTER IX.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. *Influence of the Papacy.*

The preceding chapters have set before us the changes which took place in the position of the patriarchs during the seventh and eighth centuries—the sees of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem reduced to subjection under the Mahometan rule; the bishops of Constantinople becoming more and more tools and slaves of the imperial court; while in the west the power of the Roman bishop is greatly and rapidly increased. This advance of the papacy was much aided by the circumstance that Rome, although often taken by barbarians, never remained long in their possession.[a] It alone retained its ancient character, while in all other quarters the old national distinctions were obliterated by successive invasions. The popes alone kept their ground amid the revolutions of secular powers; and their authority was vastly extended as nation after nation of the barbarian conquerors was brought within the sphere of Christian influence. As in former times the bishop of Rome had been regarded by the orientals as the representative of the whole western church, so he now appeared to the new nations of the north and of the west as the representative and source of Christianity on earth. St. Peter was regarded as holding the keys of heaven, and as personally connected with his successors.[b] The popes strengthened their position at once by detaching themselves from the Byzantine empire, and by entering into an alliance with the princes of the west on terms such as the empire had never admitted. They were connected by mutual interest with the Frankish kings, especially with those of the second dynasty. Charlemagne's conquests gave them a supremacy over the church of northern Italy, which they had in vain desired in the time of the Lombard princes.[c] By the donations of Pipin and of Charlemagne they acquired a new secular power; and it would seem to have been about the same time that the forged donation of Constantine appeared, to assert for them a more venerable claim to a wider jurisdiction, and to incite the

[a] Guizot, ii. 329.
[b] Gieseler, II. i. 34.
[c] Guizot, ii. 332

Frankish sovereigns to imitate the bounty of the first Christian emperor.[d] Constantine, it was said, in consideration of the superiority of ecclesiastical to secular dignity, relinquished Rome to Pope Sylvester, and transferred his own residence to Byzantium; he conferred on the pope the right of wearing a golden crown and other insignia of sovereignty, and he bestowed on him Italy with other provinces of the west.[e] In substance this forgery is supposed to have been as old as the time of Pipin, although in its present form it is probably somewhat later. It justified the Romans in withdrawing themselves from the empire; it warranted the popes in the possession of all that they had gained, since this was but a part of what was said to have been bestowed on their see by the first Christian emperor. The fable retained its credit, although not unquestioned, throughout the middle ages, but on the revival of learning it was soon universally abandoned.[f]

The mission of Augustine introduced the papal influence into England, where a new church arose, strongly attached to Rome, and fruitful in missionaries who established the Roman ascendancy in Germany and in Gaul. The English church owned subjection to the pope, not so much on account of his supposed succession to St. Peter, as because, having derived its origin from Rome, it was included in the Roman patriarchate by the same principle which subjected the Abyssinians to the see of Alexandria.[g] But as the papal power increased elsewhere, the subjection of England to it became also greater. The Council of Cloveshoo,[h] assembled by Ethelbald, king of Mercia, opened with the reading of two letters from Zacharias, "the pontiff and apostolic lord, to be venerated throughout the world;" and it is acknowledged that the reading of these documents, in which he exhorts the English of every degree

[d] Thus Adrian styles Charlemagne a "new Constantine" in magnifying the bounty of the elder emperor. Gieseler, II. i. 41.

[e] The forger of the eighth century here confounded the extent of the empire in the west, under Constantine, with that to which it had shrunk in his own time. Gieseler, II. i. 190.

[f] Baronius gives up the document, but attempts to maintain the fact of the donation. He indulges in ingenious conjectures, such as that Constantine may have made the gift, and Sylvester may have magnanimously refused it; or that the forgery was contrived in the Greek interest, with a view of ascribing the power of the popes to a human origin (324, 118-20). Tillemont (Emp. iv. 142) exposes his disingenuousness. Comp. De Marca, iii. 12; Mosh. ii. 141; Gibbon, iv. 490-1; Schröckh, xix. 595-7; Gieseler, II. i. 41, 189-190; Neander, v. 168; Gfrörer, Die Karolinger, i. 76.

[g] Planck, ii. 704, 715. See as to the Abyssinian Church, vol. i. p. 270.

[h] This place has been identified with Cliff-at-Hoo, near Rochester (Fuller, i. 152); Shovesham, now Abingdon (Rapin, n. in Fuller; Somner and Gibson, quoted by Wilkins, i. 161; Johnson, i. 292-4). Tewkesbury (Kemble, ii. 191), &c. Mr. Thorpe says that the true date is 742, instead of 747, as usually given (note in Lappenberg, tr. i. 225).

to reformation, under the threat of an anathema, was in obedience to his "apostolical authority."[i] In 785, two Roman legates—the first (as they said) who had been sent into England since the time of Augustine[k]—visited this country with a view to the reformation of the church. Councils were held in their presence at Chalchythe[m] in Mercia, and in Northumbria. Offa, king of Mercia, then the most powerful of the English kingdoms, attended the meeting at Chalchythe. In consequence of some offence which he had taken, on political or other grounds, at Janbert, archbishop of Canterbury, he wished that Lichfield should be erected into an archiepiscopal see. Janbert strongly opposed a scheme by which his metropolitan authority was to be limited to the kingdoms of Kent and Sussex; for York had already been re-established as an archbishoprick.[n] But it is supposed that the legates at Chalchythe favoured the change;[o] and it received the sanction of pope Adrian.[p] Some years later, however, Kenulph, the second successor of Offa, having annexed Kent to Mercia, and being desirous to conciliate the clergy of his new territory,[q] joined with Athelard, archbishop of Canterbury, in a request that Leo would again reduce the see of Lichfield to its original condition. Athelard went to Rome in order to press the suit; the pope consented, and by his license the new archbishoprick was abolished by a council held at Cloveshoo in 803.[r]

[i] Wilkins, i. 94; Johnson, i. 243. It has been supposed that a letter in which Boniface sent some canons lately passed by a council at Mentz to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, and urged the assembling of a council for reformation of abuses in England, was a chief cause of the meeting at Cloveshoo (Inett, i. 174; Johnson, i. 241). Much has been made by some protestant controversialists of the fact that, although the German canons were in general adopted at Cloveshoo, one relating to the pope was omitted. But I must agree with Dr. Lingard (Anglo-Saxon Church, i. Append. G), that the estimation in which the pope was held by the English council is sufficiently proved by the preface to its canons, as quoted in the text; and also that the second canon, in which the bishops bind themselves to cultivate peace and charity, "without flattery of any person," is not meant to refer to the pope, but is to be explained by the fact that the assembled prelates were subjects of different sovereigns. (i. 390-1.) I feel myself obliged to avow my inability to sympathise with the contentiousness which some respectable Anglican writers think it necessary to display on such points. To mix up the question of our present position as to Rome with inquiries into the history of the Anglo-Saxon church, tends to obscure historical truth, while it is altogether needless and useless for the purposes of controversy. If we believe ourselves able to show that the Roman claims and peculiarities of doctrine are unwarranted by the primitive church, we can surely afford to discuss their growth in a spirit of dispassionate impartiality.

[k] Wilkins, i. 146.

[m] Bishop Gibson supposes this place to be *Kelcyth*, in Lancashire (Johnson, i. 265). Dr. Lingard suggests *Chelsea* (Hist. Eng. i. 140-1); Mr. Soames, Chalk, or Challock, both which are in Kent. Ang. Sax. Ch. 107.

[n] See p. 133.

[o] Johnson (i. 283-4) questions this.

[p] See Johnson, i. 283-7, and the editor's notes; Collier, i. 319; Lingard, Hist. Eng. i. 140.

[q] Lappenberg, tr. i. 239.

[r] W. Malmesb. i. 87-9; Wilkins, i. 160-6.

Ina, king of Wessex, in 726[s] resigned his crown, and went on pilgrimage to Rome, where he ended his days as a monk; and his example was followed by other Anglo-Saxon sovereigns. It has been said that the tribute of a penny from every hearth in England, afterwards known as *Romescot* or *Peterpence*,[t] was first granted by Ina, and was confirmed by Offa in 794.[u] But it would seem that the donation of Ina is imaginary, and that in the case of Offa a payment of 365 mancuses towards the lighting of St. Peter's and the relief of pilgrims—an eleemosynary grant from the crown—has been confounded with the Romescot of a later time, which was a tax levied on the subject, and was interpreted by the advocates of the papacy as an acknowledgment that this island was held in fee from the successors of St. Peter.[x]

II. *Relations of Church and State.*

(1.) The right of confirming elections to the papacy had been exercised by the Byzantine emperors from the reconquest of Italy under Justinian until the iconoclastic disputes led to the omission of the form in the case of Gregory III., although he applied for the exarch's sanction. The Carolingian emperors assumed the same privilege[y] as a part of their sovereignty.[z] The story that, during Charlemagne's visit to Rome in 774, Adrian, with a synod of a hundred and fifty-three bishops, bestowed on him and his successors the right of nominating the popes, is now rejected.[a] It and other such inventions are supposed to have originated in later times from the wish of the Roman party to represent the superintendence which the Frank princes exercised over ecclesiastical affairs as derived from the concession of the popes.[b]

(2.) In the east, where no political power was attached to the episcopal office, the emperors had not usually interfered in the appointment of bishops, except at Constantinople and other cities in which they themselves resided.[c] The second council of Nicæa enacted[d] that bishops should be chosen by their episcopal brethren,

[s] Lappenb. tr. i. 266.

[t] This name was derived from the circumstance that it was payable at the feast of St. Peter *ad Vincula* (commonly called Lammas, from the charge "Feed my lambs"). In like manner money due at the Annunciation was styled "our Lady's rent." Collier, i. 335-6.

[u] Baron. 775. 10; Fuller, i. 148, 161.

[x] See Inett, i. 220-2; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 282-3; Hist. Eng. i. 142-6, 161; Lappenberg, tr. i. 205, 236.

[y] See Book II. c. i.

[z] Guizot, ii. 537.

[a] Thomassin, II. ii. 20-5; Pagi, xii. 410-1; n. in Mosheim, ii. 144-5; Schröckh, xix. 599.

[b] Gieseler, II. i. 40-1.

[c] Fleury, Disc. ii. sect. 10; Schröckh, xix. 403.

[d] Can. 3.

and that any nomination by princes should be invalid. But in the new states of the west the position of the bishops as great land-owners, and the political importance which they acquired, occasioned a remarkable mixture of secular and spiritual things. Although it was again and again enacted by Frankish councils that the elections of bishops should be free, without any other condition than the approbation of the sovereign, the usual practice throughout the period appears to have been that bishops were appointed by the crown, whether the nomination were or were not followed by a formal election on the part of the clergy and people.[e] In 614 a synod at Paris enacted that a bishop should be appointed without any payment, by the concurrence of the metropolitan and bishops of the province with the clergy and people of the city.[f] But Clotaire II., in ratifying the cānons, introduced considerable alterations in favour of the royal prerogative; and among them he required that a bishop should be consecrated under a mandate from the crown, and reserved to himself the power of naming a clerk from his household to a vacant see, although he promised in so doing to have regard to the learning and merit of the nominee.[g] It has been supposed that Charlemagne, by a capitulary of 803,[h] professed to restore the ancient usage of election by the clergy and people; but no such enactment was really issued until the reign of Louis the Pious,[i] while it is certain that in the appointment of bishops the great emperor followed the example of his predecessors, and that he was imitated by his descendants.[k]

In Spain, the fourth council of Toledo, in 633, enacted that a bishop should be chosen by the clergy and people of his city, and that the election should be approved by the metropolitan and

[e] Fleury, Disc. ii. sect. 10; Schröckh, xix. 409-410; Planck, ii. 112-8; Rettberg, ii. 605-7. Perhaps, as Dom Pitra says (Vie de S. Léger, 154-5), the bishops, while they maintained the theory of election, may have found it practically a less evil to leave the appointment to the crown than to the rude laity in general.

[f] Hard. iii. 551.

[g] "Vel certe si de palatio eligitur, per meritum personæ et doctrinæ ordinetur." (Pertz, Leges, i. 14.) Planck (ii. 119) and Rettberg (i. 293) give the interpretation which I have followed; but Thomassin (II. ii. 10, 13; 13, 6) thinks that the words were meant to allow the bishops a power of examining the nominee's qualifications.

[h] Hard. iv. 453, c. 2.

[i] Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 817, c. 2; Pertz, Leges, i. 206. See Rettberg, ii. 607.

[k] See the Formularies of Marculf, i. 5-7, in Baluze, Capitularia, t. ii.; Planck, ii. 119; Guizot, ii. 320; Ellendorf, i. 239. There was some difference between Adrian and Charlemagne on the subject of a commissioner being sent to attend the election of an archbishop for Ravenna. But the pope's objection to this went no farther than pointing out that it had not been done on a former occasion; and the tone of his letter, which is very respectful, is greatly misrepresented by the Centuriators and Baronius, who say "ipsum mendacii arguit et objurgat." See Bouquet, v. 570.

synod of the province.[m] But at another council held at the same place in 681, the appointment of bishops by the royal authority alone is mentioned as a matter of settled custom. The process of this change is unknown.[n]

In England, although Wihtred, king of Kent, in 696, disclaimed the right of appointing bishops,[o] the royal authority influenced their appointment, as they were chosen by the witte-nagemot of each state in the presence of the king.[p] And here, as in other countries, the influence of the crown gradually became more absolute. From letters written by Alcuin, a century after Wihtred's time, on a vacancy in the archbishoprick of York, it appears that the ancient freedom of election was giving way; that kings assumed an increased control over the choice of bishops, or even disposed of sees by gift.[q] In the ninth century, the nomination of bishops had passed into the hands of the sovereign, while a shadow of the earlier system was kept up in a formal election of the person so appointed, and in the publication of his name from the pulpit of the cathedral, to which the people replied by acclamations and wishes of long life to their new pastor.[r] A.D. 796.

(3.) The Frankish sovereigns, in their continual movements, required a staff of clergy to attend on them for the performance of divine service. At the head of this body was placed the archchaplain, whose office became one of great importance. Sometimes it was filled by a presbyter; sometimes by a bishop, who, in such a case, required a special dispensation for absence from his diocese; but, whether bishop or presbyter, the archchaplain stood next in dignity to the family of the sovereign, and at synods he took precedence even of archbishops. Combining the functions of chancellor with those of chaplain, he acted as a minister for spiritual affairs; he received reports from the bishops as to the state of their churches, prepared the king's ecclesiastical capitularies and other documents, and conducted his correspondence on matters which concerned the church.[s] Such being his position, it depended on individual character whether the archchaplain should sway the

[m] C. 19.

[n] Conc. Tolet. xii. c. 6. See Thomassin, II. ii. 15; Schröckh, xix. 414.

[o] Wilkins, i. 57.

[p] Kemble, ii. 221.

[q] See Lingard, A. S. C. i. 92-3.

[r] Planck, ii. 122; Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 24; Lappenberg, tr. i. 190; Kemble, ii. 377.

[s] Adalhard. de Ordine Palatii, ap. Hincmar, t. ii. 206-8; Thomassin, I. ii. 110; Pagi, xiii. 169; Planck, ii. 150; Luden, v. 152-3; Ducange, s. voc. *Capellanus*, where a list of the archchaplains is given.

prince, or the prince should by means of him obtain a control over the administration of the church.[t]

(4.) The mixture of clergy and laity in the Frankish councils has been already mentioned.[u] The capitularies bear a marked impress of clerical influence;[x] but it was possible for sovereigns, by the help of their lay vassals, often to overrule the proposals of the bishops as to ecclesiastical affairs, or to carry measures notwithstanding their opposition.[y] Sometimes, however, the clergy were assembled by themselves, as at Verne or Verneuil, in 755, where abbots for the first time appear as members of a Frankish council.[z]

In Spain, from the time when king Recared and his nobles appeared at Toledo, for the purpose of arranging the change from Arianism to the catholic faith (A.D. 589), mixed councils of clergy and laity, summoned by the sovereign, were frequently held.[a] At the earlier sessions of these, from the seventeenth council of Toledo, in 694, the affairs of the church were first discussed by the bishops and abbots, without the presence of the laity; but on the fourth day, the nobles, the judges, and others, were called in to take a part in their deliberations.[b]

Among the Anglo-Saxons, the kings and other laymen attended ecclesiastical synods, while the bishops sat in the *witteuagemote*, or secular assemblies. The part which the laity took, however, in councils, did not extend to matters purely spiritual, although it was for them to confirm, by the authority of law, the decisions of the clergy in such matters.[c] Bishops took precedence of the lay nobility; and sometimes the archbishops signed the acts of synods before the king himself, as was the case at Chalchythe in 785.[d]

(5.) The claims of the ecclesiastical and of the secular judicatures in France were variously settled by successive enactments. It may be said in general, that, while the clergy were not amenable to secular judgment in questions between members of their own order or in the case of ecclesiastical offences, the trial of questions between clerks and laymen belonged to a mixed

[t] Planck, ii. 149-152; Guizot, ii. 32.
[u] See vol. i. 505; vol. ii. 138.
[x] Sismondi, ii. 176-8; Guizot, ii. 226-7.
[y] Planck, ii. 148.
[z] Rettberg, ii. 626.
[a] Lembke, i. 85.
[b] Schröckh, xix. 462; Planck, ii. 144; Gibbon, iii. 420-2. On the clerical influence traceable in the ancient Spanish laws, see Guizot, i. 488. (I have mentioned this arrangement too early in vol. i. 506.)
[c] Joyce, England's Sacred Synods, 127.
[d] Johnson, i 284; Planck, ii. 146; Soames, 267.

tribunal of lay and spiritual judges.[e] In important criminal charges, the lower clergy were not to be tried except with the bishop's knowledge or co-operation—a privilege which was enjoyed in all cases by the bishops, priests, and deacons.[f] This principle of mixed tribunals was approved by Charlemagne;[g] but he seems to have at length exempted the clergy from all secular judgment.[h] The right of judicature was not supposed to be inherent in the episcopal office; in the ninth century bishops are threatened with the loss of it if they neglect to exercise it more diligently;[i] and from metropolitans as from secular judges the appeal lay to the emperor, beyond whom there was no appeal.[k] Among the Franks, as formerly under the Roman empire, there were many canons to prohibit clerks from carrying their grievances to the sovereign, without abiding the judgment of their immediate superiors, or obtaining the leave of these.[m] Clotaire II., in his edict of 614, ordered that no such recourse to the king should be allowed, except in order to sue for pardon; but the royal letter of pardon was a protection against all punishment, and the bishops were bound to obey it.[n]

In Spain, canons are found which forbid ecclesiastics to judge in cases of blood, or to inflict mutilation of the members.[o]

In England, the judgment of clerks was as yet on the same footing with that of the laity.[p] But this was before a mixed tribunal, the bishop sitting in the county-court, with the ealdorman or earl, as the priests of the old Saxon heathenism had done.[q] The papal legates at the council of Chalchythe objected to this custom, as tending to implicate the bishops too much in worldly affairs.[r] But notwithstanding their remonstrance, the practical usefulness of the

[e] Conc. Paris. A.D. 614, c. 4; Edict. Clotar. ap. Hard. iii. 654; Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 789, c. 28 (Pertz, Leges, i. 58); Planck, ii. 162-8; Rettberg, ii. 640.

[f] Pertz, Leges, i. 34; Rettberg, i. 640-1.

[g] Planck, ii. 168-170. It is agreed that Charlemagne was not the author of a law ascribed to him, and dated in 810 (Hard. iii. 940-1), renewing the pretended law of Constantine, by which one party in a suit might *compel* the other to submit to the bishop's judgment. (See vol. i., p. 278.) By some it is considered a forgery; Gieseler thinks that it may be a genuine *Visigothic* law. See Gies. II. i. 79-80; Hallam, Middle Ages, i. 508, and Suppl. Notes, 183.

[h] Capit. 789, c. 38 (Pertz, Leges, i. 60); Gieseler, II. i. 77; Michelet, ii. 38.

[i] Planck, ii. 171.

[k] Conc. Francof. 794, c. 6; De Marca, IV. vii. 1; Planck, ii. 171, 179, 180; 189; Gieseler, II. i. 57.

[m] *E. g.* Conc. Paris. 614, c. 3; Conc. Rem. 625 (or 630), c. 18; Conc. Cabilon. 650, c. 15; Conc. Vern. 755, c. 18.

[n] Hard. iii. 554. Against the construction which would limit the effect of the pardon to civil offences, see Planck, ii. 190-2.

[o] Conc. Tolet. iv. (633), c. 31; Conc. Tolet. xi. (675) c. 6.

[p] Planck, ii. 175; Kemble, ii. 437.

[q] Lingard, A.S.C. i. 101; Lappenberg, tr. ii. 323; Kemble, ii. 385.

[r] Conc. Chalch. (787) c. 10.

system secured its continuance, until the spiritual jurisdiction was separated from the secular by William the Conqueror, at the instance of his Norman ecclesiastical advisers.[s]

III. *The Hierarchy.—Administration of the Church.*

(1.) The metropolitan organisation had originally grown out of an analogy with the civil divisions of the Roman empire; and in the Frankish kingdom, where no such division existed, the system fell into decay. Boniface, with the countenance of Pipin and Carloman, attempted to restore it, but with very imperfect success.[t] Charlemagne, when at Rome in 774, was urged by Adrian to undertake the revival of it, and established the metropolitan jurisdiction, not only in his original dominions, but in those which he acquired.[u] But the new metropolitans had not the same influence as those of earlier times. In the national assemblies the metropolitan met the suffragan bishops as his peers, and a suffragan might by character or ability become more important than his ecclesiastical superior; while the growing connexion between France and Rome, and the increase of the papal power, drew the Frankish clergy to look beyond their metropolitans to the yet higher authority of the popes.[x]

(2.) In the eighth and ninth centuries we find frequent mention of *Chorepiscopi*—a title which has some variety of application. Of those who were subject to the diocesan bishops, some had episcopal consecration, while the greater number were merely presbyters, enjoying a delegated authority in rural places.[y] And besides these, there are frequent denunciations of chorepiscopi who were in the habit of wandering about, without any local authority, and of interfering with the rights of the established bishops by conferring orders and performing other episcopal functions.[z] The chorepiscopi of this class who disturbed the Frankish church were for the most part from Ireland,[a] where the peculiar system of the Church encouraged the multiplication of bishops without local jurisdiction.[b]

[s] Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 102; Kemble, ii. 384.

[t] See Conc. Vern. A.D. 755, Can. 2; Pagi, xii. 495; Thomassin, I. i. 33; Planck, ii. 639-641.

[u] Capitul. A.D. 779, ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 36; Capitul. 789, c. 8; Pagi, xiii. 98.

[x] Planck, ii. 649-650.

[y] Zachar. ad Bonifac. Ep. 65; Pagi, xiii. 552-3.

[z] Conc. Vern. A.D. 755, c. 13; Gieseler, II. i. 68.

[a] Mabillon, III. xx.

[b] The third council of Châlons, A.D. 813, speaks of "Scots" as ordaining irregularly, and declares such ordination to be void. (c. 43.) A council at Chalchythe, in 816, forbade "Scots" to officiate in English dioceses, "because we are not certain how or by whom they were ordained." (c. 5.) The real intention of this was to check the pro-

Others may have been consecrated by chorepiscopi, who had themselves received consecration as assistants to the diocesan bishops. But even when the original appointment and consecration were regular, chorepiscopi were often disposed to presume beyond their proper function. Charlemagne, in a letter,[c] says that the proceedings of these persons had caused great trouble and scandal. Priests, deacons, and subdeacons, who had been ordained by bishops, denied the validity of orders conferred by chorepiscopi. Pope Leo had disallowed the acts of these intruders. They were not really bishops, since they neither had been consecrated by three bishops, nor had episcopal titles to sees. Ordination, confirmation, veiling of nuns, consecration of churches and of altars, belong only to diocesan bishops, and not to chorepiscopi or presbyters, who correspond to the seventy disciples, and not to the Apostles. It is said that chorepiscopi had been made by bishops in ignorance of ecclesiastical decrees, and from a wish to devolve their own labour on others; and it is forbidden that any should be made in future.[d] But in the following century we again meet with notices of this class—most commonly in the way of censure, or of prohibition from exceeding their proper functions.[e]

(3.) Towards the end of the eighth century, the office of archdeacon acquired a new character and importance. In earlier times, there had been only one archdeacon in each diocese; but, with a view to a better superintendence of the clergy, the dioceses of the Frankish empire were now divided into archdeaconries,[f] in which the archdeacons exercised all the ordinary administration, except such acts as especially belonged to the episcopal order, and, although themselves only deacons, they had jurisdiction over presbyters.[g] The office became so lucrative that laymen attempted to intrude into it—an abuse which was forbidden by a capitulary of 805,[h] and by some canons of later date.[i] As the archdeacons

ceedings of the roving Irish bishops and clergy—not (as has been supposed) to deny the validity of Irish orders. (Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 23.) Johnson wrongly applies it to the Scots of the North. i. 302-3.

[c] Hardouin, iii. 948-950.

[d] Ib.; Rettberg, ii. 609.

[e] *E. g.* Conc. Worm. (829) c. 6, ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 335; Conc. Meld. (845), c. 44. See De Marca, II. 14, who traces their continuance to the circumstance that, although their ordinations were prohibited, they were not annulled; also Gfrörer, Die Karolinger, i. 258.

[f] Planck, ii. 585-7. The arrangement is usually ascribed to Heddo, bishop of Strasburg, who is said to have formed his diocese into seven archdeaconries, with the consent of Pope Adrian, in 774. (Planck, ii. 589-590; Gieseler, II. i. 67-8.) But Rettberg says that the documents on which this statement rests are spurious. ii. 69.

[g] Thomassin, II. i. 19, 9.

[h] C. 15; Pertz, Leges, i. 132.

[i] See Planck, iii. 771-2. Similar canons against the invasion even of parochial cures by laymen are found under the Merovingians. Conc. Rem.

were not removable except for some grave offence,[k] it was soon found that many of them endeavoured to render themselves independent of their bishops;[m] and from canons of the ninth century it would appear that their exactions, and the insolence of their followers, were severely felt by the clergy subject to their jurisdiction.[n]

(4.) The archdeaconries of the new organisation were divided into deaneries (*decaniæ*), each under an archpriest or rural-dean (*archi-presbyter.*)[o] The clergy of each deanery met on the first of every month, for conference on spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs. The conference was followed by a dinner; but complaints soon arose that these entertainments led to excess, so as to more than counterbalance the benefits of the meeting. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, in his injunctions of 852, found it necessary to denounce the abuse, and to lay down rules for moderation, restricting the allowance of the clergy on such occasions to three cups for each.[p]

(5.) The bishops were required to visit throughout their dioceses every year.[q] The expense of entertaining them on their circuits was often complained of by the clergy; and with a view to limiting it, the seventh council of Toledo ordered that the bishop should not on such occasions take more than five (or, according to a less probable reading, fifty) horses in his train.[r] But even after this limitation, the expense continued to be heavy, as appears from the list of provisions required by a Lombard capitulary of 855, which includes a hundred loaves, four large swine, a lamb, a pig, fifty pints of wine, and a sufficiency of honey, oil, and wax.[s] Louis the Pious, in 829, charges his commissioners to inquire whether the bishops in their visitations are burdensome to the clergy.[t] A capitulary of Charles the Bald, in 844, denounces the misbehaviour

A.D. 625, c. 19; Conc. Cabilon. A.D. 650, c. 5.

[k] Planck, ii. 591.

[m] Ib. 594-5; iii. 769.

[n] See Capit. Wormat. (829) c. 7, ap. Pertz, Leges. i. 336; Conc. Aquisgr. II. (836) c. 4; Hincmari Capitula, c. 1 (877), Opera, i. 738; Planck, iii. 774.

[o] Thomassin, I. ii. 1, 5; II. i. 35, 3; Planck, ii. 586-7. The council of Pavia, under the emperor Louis II., orders that archpriests should be everywhere established. Bishops must not object, on the ground that they are themselves equal to the whole care of their dioceses; but the archpriests must be strictly subject to them, and must make reports to them. Conc. Ticin. A.D. 850, c. 13. This order was renewed in a capitulary of the emperor Lambert, A.D. 898. Pertz, Leges, i. 565, c. 12.

[p] C. 15; Opera, i. 714.

[q] Capit. A.D. 769, c. 7, ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 33; Conc. Arelat. A.D. 813, c. 17; Thomassin, III. iii. 6. These visitations were called *Scalæ*, a word which is usually supposed to be a corruption of *Synodi*. (Gieseler, II. i. 73.) But Rettberg prefers to deduce it from an analogy between the episcopal visitation and that of the *missus* or *Send graf*. ii. 742.

[r] Conc. Tolet. VII. (646) c. 4.

[s] Capit. Ticin. ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 432, c. 16.

[t] Hard. iv. 1282.

which was common among the attendants of bishops when on visitation, and provides that the clergy of five neighbouring parishes shall combine to supply provisions for the usual hospitality to their diocesan. The priest at whose house the entertainment is held is to contribute in the same proportion as the others, with "perhaps" the addition of firewood and utensils.[u] The third council of Valence, in 855, censures an abuse which some bishops had introduced by exacting visitation-dues of their clergy at times when they omitted to visit.[v]

(6.) The parochial system was not yet completely organised in the Frankish church; the people in country places were often dependent for divine offices on the clergy of the cathedral city, or on the chaplain of some neighbouring castle.[x] The division of England into parishes has (as we have already seen) been ascribed to the Greek archbishop, Theodore; but, whatever his share in promoting it may have been, the general establishment of the system appears to have been slowly and gradually effected.[y]

(7.) With a view of enforcing ecclesiastical discipline, it was attempted by frequent enactments to bind the clergy by strict local ties. No stranger was to be admitted to officiate without producing letters of license and recommendation from his bishop.[z] Fugitive clerks were to be examined and sent home;[a] wandering clergy or monks, who disturbed the church by teaching error, or by raising unnecessary questions, were to be apprehended, carried before the metropolitan, and put to suitable penance;[b] all the clergy of a diocese were to be subject to the bishop's jurisdiction.[c] Presbyters were obliged to remain in the diocese where they were ordained; some councils required a promise that they would do so,[d] and Charlemagne even imposed an oath to that effect.[e] No bishop was to receive a clerk from another diocese, or to promote him to a higher degree; but while this was absolutely forbidden in a capitulary for France, the corresponding enactment for

[u] Pertz, Leges, i. 379, c. 4. Planck says that by this capitulary the laity might be asked to join in bearing the cost. (ii. 617.) But the real meaning is, that the clergy should take some of the laity with them to the visitation.

[v] Can. 22.

[x] Milman, ii. 297.

[y] See above, p. 70; Collier, i. 540-6; Bingham, IX. viii. 4; Lingard, A.S.C. i. 156-7.

[z] Conc. Aquisgr. A.D. 789, c. 3; Conc. Francof. A.D. 794, c. 28; Conc. Turon. A.D. 813, c. 13.

[a] Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 31.

[b] Conc. Ticin. A.D. 850, c. 21.

[c] Conc. Vern. A.D. 755, cc. 8, 11; Capit. A.D. 779, c. 4; Capit. A.D. 802, c. 12. (Pertz, Leges, i.)

[d] Conc. Valent. A.D. 524, c. 6; Conc. Hispal. II. A.D. 619, c. 3; and other Spanish councils quoted by Planck, ii. 575-6; Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 801, c. 13.

[e] Cap. Aquisgr. A.D. 789, c. 21, &c. (Pertz, Leges, i. 58.)

Lombardy allows it with the consent of the bishop to whose diocese the clerk had belonged.[f] And it is evident, from facts which continually meet us in history or in biography, that with such consent it was not unusual for clergymen to pass from one diocese, or even from one kingdom, to another.

(8.) During the earlier ages, ordination had not been conferred without a *title* (i.e. without assigning a particular sphere of labour) —except in rare and extraordinary instances, such as that of St. Jerome.[g] The same rule was now often re-enacted;[h] but an exception was necessarily made in the case of missionaries, and was by degrees extended to other cases. The ancient canons as to the requisites for ordination were still in force; but, after the sixth century, an important novelty was introduced by means of the tonsure. This was regarded as conferring the character of a clerk, without ordination to any particular grade of the ministry; and thus clerks were made in great numbers, without any regard to the canonical conditions or impediments of ordination.[i] It may easily be conceived that much disorder was introduced by these "acephalous" (or headless) clerks, who enjoyed the immunities of the clerical state without being bound by its obligations.[k]

(9.) The example of the royal household in France induced persons of rank to establish domestic chaplains.[m] These were often disposed to set the bishops at defiance; and it appears from the complaints of many councils that the institution had an unfavourable effect on the religion of the people in general. It is represented that the absence of the lord from the parish-church encourages his dependents to absent themselves; that the clergy have no opportunity of enforcing the duties of the rich and powerful;[n] and there are frequent complaints of attempts to withdraw the ecclesiastical dues from the bishops and parochial clergy, in order to provide for the chaplains by means of them.[o] But in addition to these evils, the chaplains were usually persons of low and disreputable character; they were miserably paid, disrespectfully treated by their employers, and required to perform degrading services.[p] The position and habits of chaplains were found to bring

[f] See Pertz, Leges, i. 36, cap. 6, A.D. 779.

[g] See vol. i. p. 300; Thomassin, I. 2, 34.

[h] Conc. Francof. A.D. 794, c. 27; Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 22.

[i] Planck, ii. 76-8; Guizot, ii. 37.

[k] The Monk of St. Gall, in his Life of Charlemagne, styles them *Circumcellions*. Pertz, ii. 734.

[m] Planck, ii. 89; Guizot, ii. 41-2; Neander, v. 150.

[n] Capit. Attiniac. A.D. 822; Convent. Ticin. 855, c. 3; Pertz, Leges, i.; also Conc. Paris, VI. A.D. 829, c. 47.

[o] E. g. Conv. Ticin. A.D. 855, c. 11.

[p] Conc. Ticin. A.D. 850, c. 18.

discredit on the whole body of the clergy, and hence Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in the reign of Louis the Pious, felt himself called on to write a treatise in vindication of "the privilege and rights of the priesthood." After showing from Scripture the estimation in which the clergy ought to be held, he proceeds by way of contrast to describe the abuses of his own time. Every person of any pretension to station, he says, then kept a priest of his own—"not to obey him, but continually to exact obedience from him, and that in unlawful as well as in lawful things." The chaplains were employed to do the work of bailiffs, butlers, grooms, or dog-keepers, to wait at table, to lead ladies' horses. As no respectable clergyman would accept such a position, the patrons, whose chief object was to obtain an excuse for deserting the public offices of religion, and emancipating themselves from the control of the clergy, cared nothing how gross the ignorance of their chaplains might be, or how infamous their lives. They usually took one of the serfs on their estates, or procured a person of servile birth for the purpose, and were offended if the bishop hesitated to ordain him as a matter of course.[q] Even if we might implicitly believe all that has lately been written against the English domestic chaplains of the seventeenth century,[r] it would appear that the class had lost nothing in dignity between the age of Agobard and that of Eachard.

(10.) A new species of ecclesiastical officers arose in Gaul during the sixth and seventh centuries, under the title of *Advocates*, *Defensors*, or *Vicedomini*—a word from which is formed the French *Vidame*. Except in name, these bore no resemblance to the Defensors of the earlier ages; the new office grew out of the peculiar circumstances of the Frankish church. The bishops and clergy required the assistance of force to protect them against the outrages of their rude and lawless neighbours. Their landed possessions imposed on them duties which were inconsistent with their spiritual office, or which, at least, might be more conveniently performed by laymen—such as secular judicature, when it was committed to

[q] Agob. de Jure et Privilegio Sacerdotii, c. 1. The Council of Worms, in 829, states that complaints had been made against bishops for refusing ordination to chaplains, and enacts that laymen shall choose fit persons, and that bishops shall not reject candidates without assigning some evident reason. c. 16. Pertz, Leges, i. 337.

[r] Macaulay, Hist. of England, i. 326-7, ed. 4; Thackeray's 'Esmond.'

[s] Planck, ii. 453. This writer finds a sort of parallel in some African canons of the fifth century; but an examination of them will show that he is mistaken. Conc. Carth. V. A.D. 401, c. 9 (the same with Can. 75 of the African code); Conc. Milev. II. A.D. 416, c. 16. In the first of these, Planck alters the application by reading *ipsis* (the bishops) for *eis* (the poor). For the early Defensors, see vol. i. 503.

them, and the leading of the contingents which their estates were required to furnish to the national army.[t] Moreover, as by the Germanic laws, none but freemen, capable of bearing arms, were entitled to appear in suits, the clergy (like women, old or infirm persons, and children) required substitutes who might appear for them, and, if necessary, might go through the ordeal of battle in their behalf.[u] For such purposes it was necessary to call in the aid of some neighbouring layman, distinguished by influence or by personal prowess; and his services were usually recompensed by the use of some land belonging to the church, and adjacent to his own.[x] The appointment of an Advocate was at first a voluntary act; but Charlemagne ordered that every church should be provided with such a champion. The qualifications for the office were very particularly defined, with a view of guarding against misconduct or encroachment; and the advocates were subject to the inspection of the imperial commissioners.[y] The sovereign assigned advocates to churches which were themselves unable to find any. As such grants had the nature of a favour, the advocates thus appointed required higher terms than those whom churches chose for themselves; and from them the others gradually learnt to assume a superiority over the churches with which they were connected, to claim dues which absorbed a large portion of the ecclesiastical revenues, and to become tyrants instead of protectors,[z] both to the clergy and to their tenants. It was not, however, until after the period which we are now surveying that their relation to the church assumed this character.

(11.) Another encroachment on the church arose out of the system of patronage. The patronage of all the churches in a diocese had originally belonged to the bishop.[a] The earliest exception was made by the first council of Orange, in 441, which enacted that where a bishop, for some special reason, had built a church within the diocese of another, he should, in consideration of his bounty, be allowed to nominate the incumbent.[b] Justinian, as we have seen, granted a like privilege to lay founders of churches;[c] and in the west the custom of lay patronage became general. In some cases, the right expired with the founder, while in others it was continued to his representatives.[d] But patrons were not

[t] Planck, ii. 454-9; Hallam, Midd. Ages, i. 143; Gieseler, II. i. 76-7.

[u] Planck, ii. 455-7; Rettberg, ii. 611-2.

[x] Planck, ii. 459, 463.

[y] Capit. A.D. 783, c. 3; 802, c. 13. (Pertz, Leges, i. 46, 98.)

[z] Planck, ii. 464-6; Rettberg, ii. 616; Floto, Heinrich IV. i. 83.

[a] Thomassin, II. i. 33-4.

[b] Can. 10; Thomassin, II. i. 29; Walter, 488.

[c] Vol. i. 504.

[d] Planck, ii. 623-5.

always content with the power of nominating clerks. Sometimes the builder of a church reserved to himself a certain portion of its revenues; sometimes the church was built on speculation—the founder expecting to get more than a reimbursement from the oblations, while he made a composition to pay the incumbent a certain allowance.[e] Against this practice canons were directed, which forbad bishops to consecrate churches erected on such conditions.[f] But the patron was considered to have a legal interest in the preservation and right disposal of the property belonging to his church.[g] Charlemagne allows the sale of churches;[h] and Louis the Pious enacted that, if the incumbent of a church should have a surplus of income, he is to pay "due service" to his landlord.[i] The division of inheritance was sometimes carried into the disposal of church-patronage, so that an "altar" might be divided into several portions, belonging to a like number of priests:[k] such divisions were forbidden by a capitulary of Louis the German, in 851.[m]

A canon of the fourth Council of Toledo provides that, if the founder or benefactor of a church, or his descendants, fall into poverty, an allowance shall be made to them out of its revenues.[n]

The question of patronage was a fruitful source of disagreements between bishops and secular lords.[o] Canons were passed for the purpose of guarding against abuses on both sides—enacting that no layman should present or eject a clerk without the consent of the bishop; while, on the other hand, the bishop was forbidden to reject a presentee except on good and valid grounds.[p]

(12.) In the beginning of the period, we find Gregory the Great frequently denouncing Simony. He complains of this "first of heresies"—this "buying and selling of doves in the temple,"—as prevailing in all quarters—in Gaul, in Germany, in Africa, in Greece and Epirus, in the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem;[q] and he continually urges

[e] Planck, ii. 634; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 192; Rettberg, ii. 617.
[f] Conc. Bracar. A.D. (572), c. 6.
[g] Planck, ii. 627; Rettberg, ii. 617.
[h] Planck, ii. 625.
[i] Capit. A.D. 817, c. 10; Pertz, Leges, i. 207.
[k] Thomassin, II. i. 31-4.
[m] C. 5; Pertz, Leges, i. 412; Cf. Conc. Tribur. A.D. 895, c. 32.
[n] Conc. Tolet. IV. A.D. 633, c. 38.
[o] Rettberg, ii. 618.
[p] Capit. A.D. 809 (Pertz, Leges, i. 161); Conc. Arelat. c. 4; Conc. Mogunt. c. 29; Conc. Taron. c. 15 (all in 813); Capit. A.D. 817, c. 9 (Pertz, i. 207); Thomassin, II. i. 31.
[q] Epp. v. 53, 55, 57; vi. 8; ix. 49, 106; xi. 46; xii. 28; xiii. 41; Hom. in Evang. I. iv. 4, etc.

both princes and high ecclesiastics to join with him in labouring to suppress it. But in defiance of all denunciations and penalties, the evil continued, and to the end of Charlemagne's reign there are frequent complaints both against patrons who, for the sake of gifts, nominated worthless persons to ecclesiastical office, and against bishops who corruptly gave ordination.[r]

(13.) The Frankish church continued to increase in wealth. Estates, sometimes of very great extent, were bestowed on it with the declared object of securing for the giver the remission of his sins and the salvation of his soul.[s] And the inducements to make such donations were increased by the system of *precarious* contracts—so called because the giver, in endowing the church with his lands, *prayed* that the use of them might be allowed him for his lifetime.[t] Thus many who would have scrupled to deprive themselves of the income arising from an estate, were enabled to perform an act of bounty without expense to themselves, or even to make a profit by it; for the church, in consideration of the reversion assured to it, in many cases allowed a donor to enjoy not only his own land, but other lands of perhaps much greater value than that which was eventually to pass from his heirs.[u] With a view to the limitation of this abuse, it was enacted by the council of Epernay, in 846, that a donor of land should not be allowed to receive more than twice the value of his gift by way of addition; that kings should not sanction precarious contracts except at the request of the church; and that, agreeably to ancient custom, the contract should require renewal every fifth year.[x]

(14.) The lands of the church were either cultivated by its serfs for the benefit of the owners, or they were let to tenants, whether free or servile, who paid a fixed proportion of the produce by way of rent.[y] In addition to these lands and to the oblations, the ecclesiastical revenues were now swelled by the general imposition of *tithes*. Under the old Roman system, a tenth of the produce of land was paid by the *coloni* to the state as rent; and when lands were granted on this condition to a corporation, a

[r] E. g. Capit. A.D. 789, c. 21 (Pertz, Leges, i. 57); Conc. Mog. A.D. 813, c. 30; Conc. Rem. A.D. 813, c. 21; and some of the canons cited in note above.

[s] Mosheim, ii. 134.

[t] They were also styled *precariæ*, because the church *lent* the lands on the terms proposed. Rettberg, ii. 704. See Marculf, Form. ii. 40; Thomassin, III. i. 8; Guizot, iii. 26.

[u] Planck, ii. 390-4; Rettberg, ii. 704-5.

[x] C. 22. See Pertz, Leges, i. 388, 390.

[y] Rettberg, ii. 718-720.

second tenth—a ninth of the remaining produce—was paid by the tenant to whom it was underlet. These two payments were known by the name of "tenths and ninths" (*decimæ et nonæ*).[z] The church was a large holder of lands under the state, and consequently exacted the ninths from its tenants; sometimes, by special grant, it was excused from the payment of the fiscal tenth, and thus was entitled to receive tenths as well as ninths for its own benefit.[a]

The ecclesiastical or Levitical tithe was a third charge, distinct from these rent-payments.[b] The first canon which required it was passed, by the council of Mâcon, in 585.[c] But it would seem that this canon had little effect, and no attempt to reinforce it was made by the Frankish councils during the remainder of the Merovingian period. Pipin for the first time added the authority of the secular power to that of the church for the exaction of tithes;[d] but little was done until the reign of Charlemagne, who, by a capitulary of 779, enacted that they should be paid.[e] The payment was enforced, not only by excommunication, but by heavy civil penalties, graduated according to the obstinacy of the delinquent;[f] and the obligation was extended to the newly-acquired territories beyond the Rhine, where (as we have already seen) it had the effect of exciting a strong prejudice against the Christian faith.[g] The council of Frankfort (A.D. 794) represents the opposition to tithes as one of the provocations by which a late scarcity had been caused; devils, it is said, had been seen devouring the hoarded corn of those who refused the church its due, and voices had been heard in the air uttering reproof of the general sin.[h]

The tithe had at first been exacted only for corn. It was then extended to other productions of the soil, such as flax and wine, and in some places to the increase of animals. The enactments of Charlemagne's time usually speak of it as payable on the "whole property."[i] But it was long before the clergy succeeded in establishing a general compliance with their claims in this respect.

[z] Rettberg, ii. 708-710; Gieseler, II. i. 74.

[a] Rettberg, ii. 627-633, 710, 713.

[b] See Gieseler, II. i. 74; Döllinger, ii. 32; and Rettberg, ii. 711-5, with his citations from the capitularies of 779, the councils of Frankfort and Mentz, &c.

[c] Can. 3.

[d] Martin, ii. 387.

[e] Pertz, Leges, i. 36, c. 7.

[f] Capit. Langob. A.D. 803, c. 19 (Pertz, Leges, i. 111); Gieseler, II. i. 74.

[g] See p. 131.

[h] C. 25.

[i] E. g. Capit. Aquisgr. 801, c. 6; Planck, ii. 419-23; Rettberg, ii. 716.

The capitulary of 829 forbids the receiver of tithe to give food to the payers, or any other consideration which might lead them to suppose that the payment depended on their own will.[k]

In England, tithes appear not to have been enforced until about the end of Bede's lifetime.[m] But soon after this, they are mentioned in the Excerptions of Egbert, archbishop of York;[n] Boniface is a witness for their payment in his native country,[o] and his exertions contributed to the measures by which it was established among the Franks and their dependents.[p]

(15.) The abuse by which the Frankish princes granted the beneficial use of church-lands to laymen had defied the efforts of St. Boniface, and continued throughout the reign of Charlemagne. The holders of such benefices[q] were now required by canons to pay tenths and ninths to the church, and also to repair, or contribute to repair, the churches which were situated on their lands.[r] But it would appear that great difficulty was found in enforcing the canons against this powerful class; the council of Tours, in the last year of the reign, states that complaints had often been made to the *missi* of their neglect to pay tenths and ninths, but that such complaints met with no attention.[s]

(16.) The disposal of the church's income was still in the hands of the bishops, but in the new kingdoms of the West the deacons did not, as such, take the same part in the administration of it by which they had become so important an order in the earlier ages.[t] The steward (*œconomus*), by whom the bishop was assisted in this part of his administration, might be either a deacon or a priest; his dignity was next to that of the bishop, and he had the guardianship of the see when vacant.[u] The division was in some places *quadripartite*—one portion being assigned to the bishop and his household, one to the rest of the clergy, one to the poor and strangers, and one to the fabric and expenses of the church;—in

[k] C. 5, 7 (Pertz, Leges, i. 350).

[m] A.D. 730. See Lingard, A. S. C. i. 183.

[n] No. 43. Johnson, i. 229 (A.D. 740).

[o] Ep. ad Cudberct. c. 6; Kemble, ii. 480.

[p] There has been much discussion as to a grant by which Ethelwulf, the father of Alfred, in 854-5, bestowed some kind of tenth on the Church. (Asser, in Stevenson, ii. 445.) This has been described as the first English law for the general payment of tithes (Inett, i. 271-280); but the best authorities consider that it related, not to tithes, but to a tenth part of the king's land in Wessex. See Spelman's Life of Alfred, with Hearne's note. Oxf. 1709, p. 22; Lingard, Hist. Eng. i. 175; Hallam, Suppl. Notes, 181; Thorpe, n. in Florent. Wigorn. i. 74.

[q] This was the only sense of the word *benefice* then known. Fleury, Disc. ii. c. 8. See Guizot, iii. 22.

[r] Conc. Francof. A.D. 794; cc. 25-6; Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 42; Conc. Arel. A.D. 813, c. 25.

[s] Can. 33.

[t] Planck, ii. 445-7.

[u] Thomassin, III. ii. 8-9.

some, it was *tripartite*—a third to the bishop, one to the clergy, and one to the necessities of the church.[x] The tripartite division was known as the Spanish custom; the other, as the Roman;[y] and bishops are found announcing that, although entitled to the third part which was prescribed by the canon of Toledo, they will be content with a quarter, agreeably to the usage of Rome.[z] The bishops were sometimes charged by the inferior clergy with taking more than their due proportion, and canons were passed in order to restrain them from doing so.[a] Even where the gross amount of the clergy's share was fairly paid to them, the allowance of each individual still depended on the bishop's will, and thus he had every clerk at his mercy.[b] Where the tithe was paid in kind, it is probable that some composition was agreed on between the local clergy and the bishops, in order to avoid the inconveniences of removing it.[c] The council of Worms, in 829, ordered that bishops who had a sufficiency from other property should relinquish their canonical share of the tithes for the uses of the Church and of the poor.[d]

Capitularies were often passed to prevent the payers of tithes from taking the disposal of them into their own hands, instead of leaving it to the bishops; and from transferring the payment from the church to which it rightfully belonged to some other, which private reasons might lead them to prefer. In such cases, the *missi* were to take care that proper restitution should be made.[e]

There is some inconsistency in the enactments of Spanish councils as to the dues which should be paid to the bishops. The council of Braga, in 572, forbids them to take the third part of the oblations, and instead of it allows them only a yearly payment of two *solidi* from each parish.[f] The fourth council of Toledo, held in 633, under a different government, in enacting that the bishop should not take more than a third, makes no reference to

[x] See Conc. Tolet. IV. A.D. 633, c. 33; Capit. A.D. 799, c. 13 (Pertz, Leges, i. 78); Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 801, c. 7 (ibid. 87), etc.; Planck, ii. 240; Rettberg, ii. 722. Thomassin mentions other divisions, III. ii. 15-8.

[y] Archdeacon Hale, in two pamphlets published in 1832-3, has shown reason for believing that these divisions never existed in England.

[z] Heito, of Basel, about A.D. 820, Capit. 15 (Hard. iv. 1243). So the Lombard bishops at Pavia, A.D. 856, c. 15 (Pertz, Leges, 410). Such passages seem to refute the opinion quoted from Fra Paolo by Archd. Hale (On Tithes, i. 21), that the tripartite and quadripartite divisions only prescribed the appropriation of portions to certain uses, without requiring that they should be equal.

[a] Planck, ii. 601-2.

[b] Planck, ii. 598-600.

[c] Planck, ii. 610. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans (797), forbids the storing of hay or other crops in churches, c. 8. Hard. iv. 914.

[d] C. 5. Pertz, Leges, i 335.

[e] E. g. Capit. A.D. 828, c. 6 (Pertz, Leges, i. 350); Capit. Ticin. A.D. 850, c. 17 (ib. 399).

[f] C. 2.

the canon of Braga. But another council at Toledo, in 646, re-enacts that canon; and one yet later, in 655, reverts to the system of allowing the bishop a third.[g] The exaction of two *solidi* afterwards found its way into France; but there, in course of time, the bishops, instead of acknowledging it as a substitute for the third part, required it as an additional due, under the name of *Cathedraticum*.[h]

The burdens imposed on the clergy by the expenses of the bishop's visitation have already been mentioned.[i] The new institution of archdeacons, who claimed dues in right of their office, also contributed to impoverish the lower clergy.[k]

(17.) The estates of the church in France, with the exception of the parish-priest's *mansus*,[m] were subject to the payment of all the ordinary taxes, unless exempted by special privilege. The case was very different in England, where church-land was exempt from all but what was styled the "threefold necessity" (*trinoda necessitas*)—the obligation to contribute towards the national forces, the building of fortresses, and the expense of bridges and highways.[n]

(18.) As in earlier ages, canons continued to be passed forbidding the clergy to engage in secular employments.[o] The council of Châlons, in 813, prohibits priests and deacons to act as bailiffs or land-stewards.[p] In England, the mass-priests were required to learn some handicraft, to practise it, and to teach it to their clerks; not, however, with a view to their own gain, but in order that they might avoid the temptations of idleness, and might have the means of relieving the poor.[q] And similar orders are found in France and elsewhere.[r]

(19.) The high social position of ecclesiastics in the Germanic kingdoms appears from the rates at which their lives were valued. The payment known by the name of *wehr*, an institution common to the whole German race,[s] was originally intended as a composition which should satisfy the relations of a slain person for his life, and should re-establish peace between them and the slayer, so that

[g] Planck, ii. 607-613.

[h] Capit. Tolos. A.D. 844, c. 2. (Pertz, Leges, i. 378.) It is here prescribed as a substitute for certain payments in kind. Cf. Planck, ii. 617.

[i] P. 184.

[k] Planck, ii. 617.

[m] Planck, iii. 445-6.

[n] See Conc. Berghamst. A.D. 696, in Wilkins, i. 50; Ethelbald, A.D. 742; ib. 86; Kemble, ii. 436.

[o] E. g. Conc. Forojul. c. 5 (Hard. iv. 858); Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 11.

[p] C. 12. So Conc. Meld. A.D. 845, c. 49. The prohibition is extended to monks, c. 57.

[q] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 169. The Anglo-Saxons gave the title of *priest* to all the clergy. The presbyters were distinguished as *mess*-priests. Ib. 147.

[r] Thomassin, III. 3, 12.

[s] Tacit. Germ. 21.

the nation might not, on account of private enmities, be deprived of the service of its members.[t] The principle by which the female relations of the slain man were excluded from any share of this payment—namely that they were not capable of carrying on a feud—might naturally have extended to the clergy;[u] but when these became a powerful order, the church claimed a wehr for their death. In France, the wehr of a presbyter was equal to that of a count; the wehr of a bishop, to that of a duke.[x] In England, the archbishop was rated in this respect as equal to an *atheling*, or prince of the blood; a bishop, to an *ealdorman*, or earl; a mass-priest, to a *thane* or lesser noble.[y]

In days when the lay nobles were unable to read or write, the possession of learning marked out ecclesiastics as the only persons qualified for many important offices. The bishops, as men of counsel, got precedence of the counts, the men of the sword.[z] It was the policy of Charlemagne to elevate the hierarchy by way of a counterpoise to the power of his rude vassals.[a] He orders that all shall pay obedience to the bishops, and declares that those who refuse it shall have no home within the empire, "even if they were his own sons."[b]

As the secular advantages of the clerical profession became greater, it was sought by members of the dominant race, who had before left it in the hands of the conquered. The occurrence of barbaric names among the clergy from the seventh century indicates the time when Franks began to become ecclesiastics;[c] and very soon after, the effect of the change is seen in the necessity of rules to restrain the clergy from secular habits and occupations. Bishops led to the field the troops which their lands were required to furnish towards the national army. They were unwilling to admit that their spiritual calling could deprive them of the birth-right which belonged to every free Frank, to share in the wars of his people; they wished, too, by proving themselves men of action, to show that their property was not to be invaded with impunity by their lay neighbours.[d] Boniface endeavoured to suppress such

[t] Turner, ii. 507-510; Rettberg, i. 643-5.

[u] Rettberg, ii. 645.

[x] The wehr, as fixed in the additions to the Salic law, A.D. 803, was, for a sub-deacon, 300 solidi; for a deacon, 400; for a monk, 400; for a priest, 600; for a bishop, 900. Pertz, Leges, i. 113; Rettberg, i. 645-8.

[y] Thorpe, 79; Turner, iii. 233; Kemble, ii. 399, 434.

[z] Planck, ii. 87-9; Martin, ii. 387.

[a] Hallam, Midd. Ages, i. 112.

[b] Hard. iv. 940.

[c] See above, p. 58. Fleury, Disc. ii. c. 8. Such names were soon in a majority, but in many cases they were adopted by the Romanized Gauls. Rückert, ii. 400.

[d] Planck, ii. 222-4.

practices; it was enacted that the clergy should not carry arms; that only so many of them should accompany the army as might be requisite for the duties of chaplains, and that these should confine themselves to their proper functions.[e] But the reform seems not to have lasted long; Charlemagne renews the orders of the earlier time, and exhorts the clergy, instead of bearing arms, to trust in God for protection.[f] A document of later date represents him as explaining that the object of such enactments was not, as the bishops had supposed, to deprive them of their honours.[g] But even during the remaining years of his reign fresh prohibitions were necessary; and when the strong hand of the great emperor was removed, the warlike inclinations of the Frank bishops were displayed in a greater degree than ever.[h]

In England, also, the clergy were disposed to bear arms, as a right belonging to their freedom, and canons were passed to restrain the practice.[i]

With the carrying of arms other secular habits and amusements are forbidden to the clergy—as the keeping of hounds and hawks,[k] games of chance,[m] noisy entertainments, worldly songs and instrumental music,[n] and the company of minstrels and buffoons.[o]

(20.) The most remarkable regulations as to the marriage of the clergy during this period belong to the east—being those of the Trullan Council (A.D. 691?). This council is strongly opposed to second marriages. Presbyters who persist in such marriages are to be deposed; if the second wife be dead, or if they separate from her, they are allowed to hold their rank, but are excluded from priestly functions. If a priest, a deacon, or a subdeacon marry a widow, he shall separate from his wife, shall be suspended, and shall be incapable of higher promotion.[p] The council forbids,

[e] Karlom. Capit. A.D. 742, c. 2 (Pertz, Leges, i. 16); Capit. Vermer. A.D. 753, c. 16 (ib. 23).

[f] Capit. A.D. 769, c. 1 (Pertz, Leges, i. 33); Capit. A.D. 789, c. 69 (ib. 64). From the order of 769, "ut sacerdotes neque Christianorum neque paganorum sanguinem fundant" (c. 2), it appears that the clergy had already made a distinction in favour of slaughtering pagans, which was recognised in the crusades.

[g] The word *honores* is supposed by some to mean *dignities*, the prohibition of arms being regarded as degrading to free-born Franks; others refer it to the *fiefs* held by bishops; as if, by being disarmed, they would become unable to defend these (see Schröckh, xix. 449; Neander, v. 140). But both the petition by which Charlemagne is said to have been requested at Worms, in 803, to prevent bishops from taking the field, and the answer here quoted (Hard. iv. 941-3), are omitted by Pertz, and are now regarded as spurious. Rettberg, ii. 637.

[h] Schröckh, xix. 556; Planck, ii. 225.

[i] Egbert, Excerpt. 155 (Wilkins, i. 112); Lingard, A. S. C. i. 103-5, 170.

[k] Capit. A.D. 869, c. 3 (Pertz, Leges, i. 33).

[m] Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 14. Canons of K. Edgar, 64 (Thorpe, 401).

[n] Conc. Forojul. c. 5 (Hard. iv. 858).

[o] Conc. Turon. III. A.D. 813, c. 5; Canons of Edgar, 58 (Thorpe, 401).

[p] C. 3.

on pain of deposition, the practice of African and Libyan bishops, who were reported to cohabit with their wives; the wife of a bishop is ordered to separate from him, and to go into a convent.[q] It censures the practice of the Armenians, who required that the clergy should be of priestly family, and allowed those who were so born to officiate as singers and readers without receiving the tonsure;[r] and it forbids the clergy to marry after their ordination as subdeacons.[s] But in its xiii[th] canon, after stating that the Roman church exacted of persons ordained as presbyters or deacons a promise to abstain from their wives, it expressly sanctions the contrary practice, and grounds its sanction on the "Apostolical Canons." No promise is to be required, no separation is to be enforced; deposition is threatened against any one who shall deprive priests, deacons, or subdeacons of their wives, and against all members of these orders who on pretence of religion shall separate from their partners. And, while the xxix[th] canon allows the clergy of "barbaric" churches to separate, if they think it their duty to do so, and if their wives consent, the permission is declared to be granted only in condescension of the weak scrupulousness[t] which may be expected in such churches.

A council which in this and in other points directly and avowedly contradicted the principles and usages of Rome was not likely to find favour with the popes, and, as we have seen, it was rejected by Sergius I.[u] But the sanction which it gave to the marriage of the clergy has ever since continued to regulate the discipline of the Greek church.

In the west, this period presents us with many enactments against the marriage of the clergy. The Merovingian kings added their authority to confirm the ecclesiastical canons which forbade it.[x] But it would seem that, notwithstanding the frequency of the prohibitions, many of the clergy continued to marry—more especially where the authority of the popes was not fully established, as in Lombardy, Spain, and some parts of Gaul and of Germany.[y] The see of Chur, in the Grisons, was hereditary in a family of bishops who combined the powers of spiritual and civil government. The wife of one of these, about the middle of the seventh century, in signing documents, styled herself *episcopa* or *antistita Curiensis*;

[q] Cc. 12, 48. This is regarded by some as the first ecclesiastical law to such effect, although it had been preceded by the civil law of Justinian. See Schröckh, xix. 177; Gieseler, I. ii. 180.

[r] C. 33.

[s] C. 6.

[t] μικροψυχία.

[u] Page 51.

[x] Theiner, i. 375.

[y] Theiner, i. 434; Rettberg, i. 656-7.

and the marriage of the bishops implies that the clergy were also at liberty to marry.[z]

A question put by Augustine to Gregory the Great seems to show that marriage had been usual among the British clergy.[a] The law of the Anglo-Saxon church on this subject was the same with that of Rome; but here too there is frequent proof that the clergy continued to enter into the married state; nor was their marriage annulled or the issue of it declared illegitimate until the latter part of the twelfth century.[b]

As in the earlier periods, the canons for the enforcement of celibacy in the clergy are accompanied by many which indicate the disastrous effects of such measures. Some of these are directed against the most hideous and unnatural sins. There are very frequent enactments as to the entertainment of females in the houses of the clergy. The fourth council of Toledo (A.D. 633) orders that their concubines shall be sold;[c] the ninth council of the same place (A.D. 655) adds that their children shall be serfs of the church.[d] Some canons forbid the clergy to have as inmates of their houses even those nearest relatives who had been allowed by the council of Nicæa,[e] alleging by way of reason that other persons had often been introduced under the pretence of relationship, and that even the laws of nature had been violated. The councils of Charlemagne's reign in general, however, are content with renewing the Nicene rule.[f]

(21.) An important attempt at reform was made about the year 760 by the institution of the *canonical* life. The title of canons (*canonici*) had formerly been given to all the clergy, on account of their being enrolled in the *canon* or register of the church, and entitled to maintenance from its funds.[g] The word was now applied in a new meaning, to designate clergy who lived under a *canon* or rule, resembling that of the monastic communities.[h] The idea of such an institution was not new, for in earlier times

[z] Theiner, i. 433-4; Rettberg, ii. 134-8.

[a] "An clerici non continere valentes possint contrahere; et si contraxerint, an debeant ad sæculum redire." (Interrog. 2. ap. Greg. Ep. xi. 64.) Instead of fully answering the question, Gregory gives the direction as to clerks in the lower orders quoted at p. 18. See Theiner, i. 379.

[b] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 176; Kemble, ii. 443-7; Rettberg, ii. 655.

[c] C. 43.

[d] C. 10.

[e] Conc. Forojul. A.D. 791? c. 4 (Hard. iv. 858); Egbert, Excerpt. 15, A.D. 740 (Wilkins, i.); Theodulphi Capitul. 12 (Hard. iv. 905); Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 801, c. 15 (Pertz, Leges, i. 88). The third council of Braga, A.D. 675, c. 5, allows none but the mother, unless with a special license.

[f] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 3 (Pertz, Leges, i. 55); Capit. A.D. 806, c. 1 (ib. 138); Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 49. So Conc. Aquisgr. A.D. 816, c. 39. But the second council of Nix, A.D. 836, c. 11, excludes all women.

[g] Thomassin, I. iii. 9, 1.

[h] Schröckh, xx. 80; Rettberg, i. 195.

Eusebius of Vercelli and the great Augustine had shown the example of living together with their clergy;[j] and more recently, a like practice had been usual in missionary bodies, where the bishop lived with his staff of clergy and monks.[k] But it was now reduced to a regular system by Chrodegang, a nephew of Pipin, and archbishop of Metz.[m]

Chrodegang's scheme was in great measure an adaptation of the Benedictine rule to the different circumstances of the clergy. The bishop held a place corresponding to that of the Benedictine abbot, the archdeacon answered to the provost or prior, the seniors had the same oversight in both systems.[n] Like Benedict, the father of the canonical institution prescribed a common dwelling, an uniform dress, a common table, a common dormitory, unless where the bishop should be pleased to allow an exception.[o] The clergy were required to attend certain services daily.[p] They were daily to practise manual labour,[q] and were to devote certain portions of their time to study.[r] The younger members of the society were to show respect to the elders—as by rising and bowing when they passed, by asking their benediction, by standing in their presence, unless permitted to sit down.[s] All were to confess to the bishop in Lent, and again in autumn; stripes or imprisonment were the penalties for going to any other confessor. All who were not prevented by sin were to communicate every Sunday and on other chief festivals.[t]

Articles of clothing were to be supplied to all the clergy at stated times; the elders were then to give up the clothes which they had worn, and these were to be transferred to the juniors.[u] All were to take their turns in the services of the house; each was in his order to cook for a week, the archdeacon and the cellarer being the only exceptions.[x] Laymen were not to be admitted, except for some special purpose, such as that of assisting in the kitchen; and they were to leave the house as soon as their work was done.[y]

The dietary of the canons was more liberal than that of the Benedictine rule.[z] They were permitted to eat flesh, except

[j] Thomassin, I. iii. 2.

[k] Rettberg, ii. 662-4.

[m] The see of Metz was only a bishoprick; but Chrodegang, who held it from 742 to 766, received the title of archbishop from the pope as a personal distinction. Rettberg, i. 494-5. There is an imperfect Life of him in Pertz, x.

[n] Chrodeg. Regula (ap. Hard. iv. 1181 seqq.), c. 35.

[o] Cc. 3-4.

[p] Cc. 5-7.

[q] C. 9.

[r] C. 8.

[s] C. 2.

[t] C. 14.

[u] C. 29.

[x] C. 24.

[y] C. 3.

[z] See Conc. Aquisgr. A.D. 816, l. i. c. 115.

during penitential seasons.[a] They had an allowance of wine (or of beer, if they preferred it), graduated according to their rank—for priests and deacons, three cups at dinner and two at supper; for subdeacons, two at each meal; for the lower orders, two at dinner and one at supper.[b] There were to be seven tables in the hall,[c] appropriated respectively to the bishop, to the various orders of canons, to strangers, and to the clergy of the city, who on Sundays and other festivals dined in the college, and partook of the instruction which was given in the chapterhouse.[d] Edifying books were to be read at meals, and, in order that they might be heard, silence was to be kept, "because it is necessary that, when one taketh his bodily food, then also the soul should be refreshed with spiritual food."[e]

The most important difference from the Benedictine rule was, that the canons were allowed to enjoy individual property—whether that which they had before entering into the society, or such fees and presents as they might receive for the performance of religious offices.[f] They were, however, obliged at their death to leave all to the brethren.

From Metz the rule of Chrodegang soon made its way to other cities.[g] The number of its chapters was increased by additions from 34 to 86.[h] Charlemagne even wished to reduce the whole of the clergy to this system;[i] and, although the attempt failed, and the great majority of the clergy continued to live as seculars,[k] many colleges of canons were formed, under the government of abbots, in addition to the cathedral bodies for which the rule had originally been intended.[m] The rule was sanctioned for general use by a great council at Aix-la-Chapelle under Louis the Pious, in 816.[n] By the middle of the ninth century it was established in almost all the cathedrals of France, Germany, and Italy, and had also been adopted in England.[o] The clergy found their account in the apparent strictness of the new system, as a means of recovering much of that popular admiration which the monks had long enjoyed to the prejudice of the hierarchical orders.[p] In

[a] C. 22.
[b] C. 23.
[c] C. 20.
[d] C. 8.
[e] C. 21.
[f] Cc. 31-2.
[g] Planck, ii. 558-60.
[h] Both forms are given by Hardouin, iv. 1181, seqq.
[i] Capit. Langob. A.D. 782, c. 2 (Pertz, Leges, i. 42); Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 789 c. 72 (ib. 65); Capit. A.D. 805, c. 8 (ib. 132).
[k] Milman, ii. 294.
[m] Thomassin, I. iii. 9. 7; Rettberg, ii. 667.
[n] The council also made other regulations for canons. Lib. i, cc. 115, seqq.
[o] Planck, ii. 560; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 163.
[p] Planck, ii. 562-4; Guizot, ii. 513-5.

consequence of this, donations were poured in on the canonical societies. The cathedral chapters became wealthy and powerful, and soon began to assert a claim to act as the bishop's advisers, and to share in the administration of the diocese.[q]

IV. *Monasticism.*

During these centuries the monks played an important part in Western Christendom. The missions to the Germanic nations were chiefly their work: they planted colonies in lonely places, where towns soon grew up, as at Fulda, St. Gall, Eichstedt, and Fritzlar. The sight of their lives, and of their successful labours in cultivating the land, spread the knowledge not only of religion, but of agriculture and civilisation among the people.[r] One effect of the employment of monks in missionary labour was to introduce more of clerical ordination into their ranks.[s] In some cases, sees were usually filled with monks from certain abbeys—an arrangement the more natural because learning was chiefly cultivated in the monastic societies. Thus Strasburg received its bishops from Münster, Spires from Weissenburg, Constance from Reichenau or St. Gall.[t]

The reputation of sanctity continued to wait on the monks. The term *religion*, which had been specially applied to the monastic profession by a council at Orleans as early as 549,[u] became more and more restricted to it.[x] Entrance on the monastic state was regarded as a second baptism. Theodore of Canterbury curiously carries out the idea by ordering that the novice shall for seven days have his head covered with the cowl, as the head of the newly-baptised was covered with the chrism or veil;[y] and a like order, although with an abridgment of the period to three days, was made under Lewis the Pious in 817.[z] Persons of high rank flocked into the cloisters; it was no unusual thing even for kings and queens to resign their royalty and assume the monastic habit.[a]

During the earlier part of the period, there was a considerable variety of rules. That of St. Columban for a time appeared to rival the Benedictine code in popularity. It became not un-

[q] Planck, ii. 632.
[r] Schröckh, xx. 16; Planck, ii. 482.
[s] Schröckh, xx. 5-7; Planck, ii. 472.
[t] Planck, ii. 470, 520.
[u] C. 19.
[x] Schröckh, xx. 6.
[y] Thorpe, 307.
[z] Capit. Aquisgr. c. 35 (Pertz, Leges, i. 202).
[a] See a list in Schröckh, xx. 10-1. A council of Toledo orders that the widows of Spanish kings should retire into a convent, and there remain without remarrying.

common to combine the two;[b] but by degrees that of St. Benedict triumphed, as being the more practically sensible, the less rigorous, and the more elastic.[c] With some slight modifications in particular cases, it became general in France, where a great excitement in its favour was produced by the translation of the founder's relics to Fleury in 750.[d] In England, too, where it was introduced by Wilfrid, it soon became general, although not without some mixture of the old national usages.[e] But the Spanish monasteries continued until the ninth century to be governed by rules which had been compiled, partly from eastern sources, by Isidore of Seville, Fructuosus of Braga, and other native bishops.[f]

The monastic societies advanced greatly in wealth by the gifts of lands which were bestowed on them. Many of them were specially exempted by sovereigns from all public imposts and tolls.[g] But such exemptions were as often tokens of poverty on the part of the house as of extraordinary favour. Thus, in a list of the Frankish monasteries, drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 817, where they are ranged in three classes, as owing to the prince both gifts and military service, as owing gifts only, or as free from all duty except prayer, the most distinguished foundations are for the most part included in the first class.[h]

The monasteries in general continued to be subject to the jurisdiction of their diocesan bishops.[i] Exemptions from this jurisdiction were now introduced; not, however, it would appear, through ambition or assumption on the part of the monks, but in consequence of the oppressive conduct of the bishops.[k] These from the seventh century began to claim a share in the gifts bestowed on monasteries. They exacted unreasonable payments from the monks for the dedication of their churches, for the consecration

[b] Mabillon, V. Præf. xli. lxxxiv. seqq.

[c] Thomassin, I. iii. 24-5; Rettberg, ii. 679-682.

[d] Schröckh, xx. 15; Planck, ii. 488. Charlemagne, in his capitularies of 811, asks, "utrum aliqui monachi esse possint præter eos qui regulam S. Benedicti observant. Inquirendum etiam, si in Gallia monachi fuissent priusquam traditio regulæ S. Benedicti in has parœchias pervenisset" (Pertz, Leges, i. 166, c. 11): and in another paper, "Qua regula monachi vixissent in Gallia, priusquam regula S. Benedicti in ea tradita fuisset, cum legamus S. Martinum et monachum fuisse et sub se monachos habuisse, qui multo ante S. Benedicto (*sic*) fuit" (ib. 168, c. 12). These questions prove that in France the systems of the earlier monachism had been superseded by the Benedictine, but the object of them is matter of conjecture.

[e] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 205-6.

[f] Schröckh, xx. 19-25.

[g] E. g. the charter granted to Corbie by Clotaire III. in 669; Hard. iii. 1010; and many in Bouquet, vol. v.

[h] Pertz, Leges, i. 223; Planck, ii. 516.

[i] Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 802, c. 15 (Pertz, Leges, i. 92); Thomassin, I. iii. 27.

[k] See e. g. the behaviour of the bishop Sidonius towards the monks of St. Gall. Baron. 759. 9-10.

of chrism, for ordaining their clergy, and installing their abbots. A large part of the revenues was absorbed by the expense of visitations; and, in addition to this, the bishops extorted heavy fees under the names of *cathedraticum* and the like.[m] When the choice of an abbot belonged to the monks, the bishops often endeavoured to wrest it from them, and exercised it without any regard to the welfare of the house or to the fair pretensions of its members.[n] The grossness of the tyranny practised by some bishops may be inferred from the fact that the monastic bodies often appealed against it to synods, and that these, although composed of bishops, felt themselves obliged to condemn it in strong terms, and to forbid its continuance.[o] In some cases during the eighth century, it was provided that if the diocesan bishop would not perform his functions with respect to a monastery on reasonable terms, the abbot might apply to another.[p] In general it may be said, that the exemptions of this period were not sought for the sake of emancipation from the rightful authority of the bishops, but from their rapacity. The bishop still retained his general supervision of religion and morals in the exempt monasteries; he was even entitled to inquire into the administration of the temporalities, while he was restrained from acts of plunder and oppression.[q]

When some monasteries had obtained such privileges, it became usual with founders to insist that those which they established should stand on a level with others in this respect.[r] There were, too, certain monasteries which were styled royal—either because they had been founded by princes, or had obtained their special protection; and these were exempt from all jurisdiction except that of the sovereign, which was exercised through the *missi* and the bishops.[s] Some, of more than ordinary dignity, had bishops of their own, resident within their walls, as was the case at St. Denys.[t] And in addition to these, it appears that the popes had already commenced a practice of granting exemption from all authority but their own.[u] The first instance is commonly said to have been a grant from Zacharias to the abbey of Fulda; but the

[m] Planck, ii. 502-3; Guizot, ii. 92-3.

[n] Planck, ii. 503; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 209.

[o] E. g. Conc. Tolet. iv. A.D. 633, c. 51, which says that bishops treat their monks like slaves. Conc. Tol. ix. A.D. 655, c. 2.

[p] Planck, ii. 675-6.

[q] Thomassin, I. ii. 28. 5; De Marca, III. xv. 6; Planck, ii. 505-8, 524-9, 539, 540; Rettberg, ii. 672-3.

[r] Planck, ii. 510.

[s] Thomassin, I. iii. 35; Schröckh, xx. 67-8; Planck, ii. 511-2; Rettberg, ii. 669.

[t] Mabillon, III. xx.

[u] Planck, ii. 529-35.

genuineness of the document is much questioned.[x] If genuine, it was granted at the request of Boniface himself, and therefore not with an intention to injure the rights of the diocesan.[y] But when the archbishoprick and the abbacy which had been united in the Apostle of Germany were divided, the privileges conferred on Fulda, and the renown which it acquired as the resting-place of his remains excited the jealousy of Lull, his successor in the see of Mentz. The archbishop complained that the exemption wrongfully interfered with his jurisdiction. He is said to have persecuted the abbot, Sturmi, by unscrupulous means—even inducing Pipin, by a charge of treason, to banish him for two years; and the enmity between the two continued to the end of the abbot's life, so that, on his deathbed, in declaring his forgiveness of all men, he thought it necessary especially to name Lull, as being the person who most needed it.[z]

Exemptions existed also in the patriarchate of Constantinople, where some monasteries were discharged from the bishop's authority and subject to the metropolitan, while others were subject to the patriarch only. In token of these privileges, the metropolitan or patriarchal crosier was erected over the altar in the chapel of the monastery.[a]

The second council of Nicæa allowed abbots, if they were presbyters, to ordain the lower clergy of their monastery.[b] The rule was adopted in the west, and from this and other circumstances, it came to pass that almost all the inmates of a monastery belonged to some grade of the clergy.[c]

The age of admission to the monastic communities was variously fixed. The Trullan council lays down that it ought not to be under ten.[d] Theodore of Canterbury names fifteen as the age for monks, and sixteen or seventeen for nuns.[e] The capitularies of 789 re-enact the old African canons which forbade the reception of women before the age of twenty-five, unless for some special reason.[f] But, besides those who took the vows on themselves, children might be devoted by their parents to the monastic state; and in this case, as in the other, there was no release from its

[x] Rettberg, ii. 677; see p. 103. Such exemptions of earlier date are undoubtedly forgeries.

[y] Planck, ii. 536-9.

[z] Vita S. Sturmii, ap. Pertz, ii. 373-7; Mabillon, iv. 279-84, 400. Rettberg (i. 610-6) thinks that Lull meant to claim the abbacy as attached to his see, and regarded Sturmi only as a vice-abbot.

[a] Schröckh, xx. 66-7. Thomassin mentions exempt monasteries in Africa, where they were subject to Carthage, I. iii. 31-34.

[b] Conc. Nic. II. A.D. 787, c. 14.

[c] Planck, ii. 472-3.

[d] C. 40.

[e] Capitul. 118 (Hard. iii. 1778).

[f] C. 46 (Pertz, Leges, i. 61).

obligations.[g] Charlemagne endeavoured to put some limit to this practice, by ordering that, "saving the authority of the canons," girls should not be veiled until they were old enough to understand their engagements.[h]

Many orders are found against the admission of serfs into monasteries without the consent of their masters, and of freemen without license from the sovereign. It was not unusual to make a false profession of withdrawing from the world, for the sake of escaping from military service. In order to check this abuse, Charlemagne orders, in 805, that those who forsake the world shall be obliged to live strictly according to rule, either as canons or as monks.[i]

Although the observance of the same rule was a bond of union between monastic societies, no more intimate connexion was as yet organised in the West. Some of the greater monasteries had *cells* or *priories* dependent on them;[k] but, except on this very limited scale, there was no affiliation of one religious house to another, nor was there any subjection of many to a common head, as had been the case in the system of St. Pachomius.[m] It was usual for an abbot, in sending forth one of his monks to found a new community, to release him from the vow of obedience so soon as he should be able to establish a footing.[n] During the earlier part of the period, it was forbidden to an abbot to have more than one monastery, although Gregory the Great allowed it in some cases;[o] but this rule was afterwards disregarded. Pluralities, both ecclesiastical and monastic, became frequent, and sometimes both kinds were held by the same person. Thus, about the year 720, Hugh, a member of the Carolingian family, was at once bishop of Paris, Rouen, and Bayeux, and abbot of Fontenelle and Jumièges.[p] In the instances where a see was usually filled from a particular monastery, the bishops often united the abbacy with their higher office; and where bishops were able to usurp the nomination to an abbacy, they sometimes took it for themselves. John, abbot of St. Gall, on succeeding Sidonius in the see of Constance, about 760, retained his abbey, added to it that of Reichenau, which Sidonius had held before him, and towards the end of his life provided for his three nephews by transferring one of his wealthy preferments to each.[q]

[g] "Monachos aut paterna devotio aut propria professio facit." Conc. Tolet. iv. A.D. 633, c. 49; Rettberg, ii. 691, 696.

[h] Capit. A.D. 805, c. 14 (Pertz, Leges, i. 132).

[i] C. 10. Pertz, Leges, i. 132.

[k] Mabillon, VII. xxii. xxvii.

[m] See vol. i. p. 295.

[n] Planck, ii. 494-5.

[o] Planck, ii. 495.

[p] Schröckh, xx. 71.

[q] Planck, ii. 761.

As monasteries grew rich, some evil consequences followed. The vow of poverty was considered to be satisfied by the renunciation of individual property. Where its obligation was felt as matter of conscience, the monks retained their original simplicity of dress and food, while their superfluous wealth was spent on other objects, such as the erection of costly buildings.[r] But very commonly the possession of the means of luxury introduced the enjoyment of it. In the East, the confessor Maximus, in the middle of the seventh century, denounces the disorderly lives of monks, and says that their profession of piety was no better than hypocrisy.[s] Charlemagne in 811 censures the abbots as caring only to swell the numbers of their monks, and to obtain good chanters and readers, without any solicitude as to their morals. He sarcastically asks how the monks and clergy understand the text against entangling themselves with the affairs of this life; whether they suppose the only difference between secular men and themselves to consist in their being unmarried and carrying no arms; whether those can be said to have forsaken the world who are incessantly striving to increase their possessions by all sorts of means—who use the hopes of heaven and the terrors of hell, the names of God and the saints, to extort gifts not only from the rich but from the poor and ignorant, and, by diverting property from the lawful heirs, drive many to betake themselves to theft and robbery. How, he continues, can they be said to have forsaken the world who suborn perjury in order to acquire what they covet? or those who retain their secular property, and are surrounded by bands of armed men?[t]

Abbots, as well as bishops, were addicted to war, to hunting, and hawking, to games of chance, to the company of minstrels and jesters. There are many ordinances against such irregularities, some of them extending to abbesses also;[u] and there are frequent complaints of gross immorality among recluses of both sexes, with attempts to restrain such sins.[x]

Towards the end of the period, a remarkable reformer of the

[r] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 225.

[s] Dupin, vi. 25.

[t] Pertz, Leges, i. 167-8.

[u] E. g. Capit. A.D. 789, c. 15 (Pertz, Leges, i. 69); Capit. A.D. 802, c. 19 (ib. 93); Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 17. Some monasteries had a special permission to kill the beasts of the chase, that the flesh might be used for the refection of sick members, and the skins for gloves, girdles, or the binding of books; but in such cases it would seem that the work was to be performed by the lay dependants of the house. See the charters granted by Charlemagne to St Denys, in 774 (Bouquet, v. 727); to Sithiu St. Omers, in 788 (ib. 752).

[x] E. g. Conc. Nic. II. A.D. 787, c. 20; Conc. Trullan. A.D. 691, c. 47; Conc. Arelat. A.D. 813, c. 7; Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 802, c. 17 (Pertz, Leges, i. 93).

monastic life appeared in France. Witiza, afterwards known as Benedict of Aniane,[y] was of Gothic descent, and son of the count of Maguelone in Septimania. When a boy, he was placed in the court of Pipin, to whom he became cupbearer, and he continued in the service of Charlemagne. In returning from Rome after his master's visit to Adrian in 774, he narrowly escaped drowning in an attempt to save his brother.[z] He had already for some years entertained the thought of embracing the monastic life, and, in gratitude for his preservation, he entered the monastery of St. Seine, in Burgundy.[a] Although he had assumed the name of Benedict, the rule of the Nursian monk appeared to him fit only for weak beginners,[b] and he rushed into the austerities of eastern monachism. He macerated his body by excessive fasting; his dress was of rags, swarming with vermin, and patched with a variety of colours; he took very little sleep, and that on the bare ground; he never bathed; he courted derision and insult as a madman, and often expressed his fear of hell in piteous outcries. His abbot repeatedly urged him to relent from these rigours, but Benedict was inflexible.[c]

On the death of the abbot, Benedict was chosen as his successor; but he fled from St. Seine, and built himself a little hermitage on his father's estate, by the bank of the river Aniane.[d] Some monks attempted to live with him, but found themselves unable to support the excessive severity of his system.[e] But in course of time a considerable society was gathered around him, and a monastery was erected near his cell. Benedict took part in the building of it; he and his monks were obliged to carry the materials, as they were unable to provide oxen for the work.[f] The walls were of wood; the roof was thatched with straw; the vestments for divine service were coarse, whereas silk was usually employed for such purposes; the eucharistic vessels were of wood, afterwards of glass, and finally of pewter. The monks lived chiefly on bread and water, varied sometimes by milk, and on Sundays and holydays by a scanty allowance of wine.[g] If the rigid simplicity of Benedict's first arrangements was partly dictated by fear lest richness of architecture and of ornament should prove injurious to monastic discipline,[h] he must afterwards have changed his opinion

[y] Vita ap. Mabillon, v. 192, seqq.
[z] Vita, c. 1.
[a] C. 2.
[b] C. 8.
[c] C. 7.
[d] C. 10.
[e] C. 11.
[f] C. 12.
[g] C. 14.

[h] This was sometimes matter of complaint. See Mabillon, V. ciii. and the capitulary of 811, c. 11 (Pertz, Leges, i. 168). Finck's idea (Ludwig d. Fromme, 239) that Charlemagne, in his sar-

on the subject; for in 782 the humble wooden buildings made way for a splendid monastery. The church was adorned with marble pillars; there were several costly chapels; and all that belonged to the furniture and to the services was of unusual magnificence.[j] Charlemagne, who had contributed to the expense, exempted the monastery from all taxes, and from the jurisdiction both of bishops and of counts.[k]

Benedict became a man of great note and influence. He was joined by Charlemagne with Leidrad and Nefridius in a commission to reclaim the adherents of Felix of Urgel;[m] Louis the Pious, while king of Aquitaine, employed him to reform the monasteries of that country; and the effect of his institutions was widely felt.[n] He collected in two books the monastic rules of the east and of the west; and in a third book he added the rules for nunneries.[o] In his reforms he was content to enforce the Benedictine rule, which experience had shown him to be better suited for general use than the rigours of Oriental monachism.[p] In his own practice, he was obliged to abate somewhat of the violence with which he had begun; but his life continued to be strictly ascetic, and he shared with his monks in the labours of ploughing, digging, and reaping.[q] Soon after the accession of Louis to the empire, he resigned the abbacy of Aniane, and removed to a new royal foundation on the bank of the Inda, near Aix-la-Chapelle;[r] and, after having played an important part during the earlier years of his patron's reign, he died at the age of seventy, in 821.[s]

In England, monachism fell into decay from the earlier part of the eighth century.[t] The monasteries were often invaded and occupied by secular persons, and, although a canon of Cloveshoo was directed against this evil, the terms which are used significantly prove that the council had little hope of being able to suppress it.[u] Boniface in his letters to Archbishop Cuthbert, and to Ethelbald, king of Mercia, complains that the English monasteries are oppressed beyond any others in Christendom; that their privileges are violated, that they are heavily and unjustly taxed, that they are ruined by the expense of entertaining the king and his hunting

castic questions of that year (quoted above, p. 206), intended to glance at Benedict, seems extremely improbable.

[j] C. 26.

[k] A.D. 787. Bouquet, v. 751; Mabillon, v. 202.

[m] See p. 158.

[n] Vita, cc. 36, 40; Mabillon, v. 218.

[o] Hist. Litt. iv. 450.

[p] Neander, vi. 98.

[q] Vita, c. 32.

[r] C. 48. It was afterwards called Cornelimünster. See Rettberg, i. 548.

[s] Schröckh, xx. 36.

[t] See p. 70.

[u] Conc. Clovesh. A.D. 847, c. 45.

train; that the monks are forced to labour at the royal buildings and other works.[x]

But much blame is also laid on the communities themselves. The monks are often charged with riotous living and with drunkenness, which Boniface describes as a peculiarly national vice;[y] and the fondness for gay clothing, which was another characteristic of the English, defied all monastic rules. Boniface complains of it to Cuthbert;[z] the council of Cloveshoe censures it in clergy, in monks and in nuns, denouncing especially in men the affectation of a laical head-dress, and the fashion of adorning the legs with fillets of various colours;[a] the council of Chalchythe[b] desires monks and canons to use the same habit with those of the continent,[c] "and not dyed with Indian dye, or very costly." But some years later Alcuin is found continuing the complaint against such vanities, and the love of them was not to be overcome.[d]

In addition to the causes which have been mentioned—the secular oppression to which the monks were subjected, and their own unwillingness, when the first period of fervour had passed away, to bear the restraints of the monastic rule—the introduction of the canonical life contributed to the decline of English monachism. The occupants of religious houses became canons instead of monks; and about the middle of the ninth century the Benedictine order was almost extinct in England.[e]

The regulations of this period as to nuns correspond in general character with those for monks. Abbesses are required to be subject to their bishops;[f] they are censured for interfering with the sacerdotal function by presuming to veil virgins, and to give benedictions and imposition of hands to men—apparently by way of ordination to the lower grades of the ministry.[g] There are frequent complaints of dissolute life in nunneries, and the abbesses themselves are sometimes charged with a share of the guilt.[h] Other canons

[x] Ep. 62, p. 137; Ep. ad Cudberct. c. 11, ap. Bed. ed. Hussey, 353. (This passage does not appear in Dr. Giles' Boniface, Ep. 63.)

[y] Bonif. ad Cudb. 10; Conc. Clovesh. c. 21; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 232-3.

[z] C. 9.

[a] Cc. 19, 28.

[b] A.D. 785, c. 4.

[c] That this is the meaning of *Orientales* appears from Can. 19 (see above, p. 111, note [c]).

[d] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 232.

[e] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 233-6.

[f] *E. g.* Conc. Forojul. A.D. 791, c. 47; Conc. Cabilon. A.D. 813, c. 65.

[g] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 75. (Pertz, Leges, i. 63.)

[h] *E. g.* a capitulary of 789 (Pertz, i. 68, c. 3) forbids nuns to write or to send amatory verses (*cinilendos*. See Rettberg, i. 452; ii. 695). There are prohibitions of intercourse between monks or clergy and nuns. (Rettb. ii. 695.) The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 836, states that many nunneries have become *lupanaria*, and that, in some cases, because the abbesses *starved* their nuns into temptation (cc. 12-3). Abbesses are ordered to take care that there be not many dark corners in their houses, as advantage is taken of them for mischief. (c. 14.)

are directed against the practice of allowing widows to take the veil during the first agitation of their bereavement, as it had been found that such nuns often relapsed into worldly business or gaieties, and endeavoured to secure at once the benefits of the monastic and of the secular life.[j]

The Benedictine rule was adapted to the use of female societies; and towards the end of the period the example of Chrodegang's rule led to the institution of *canonesses*, who lived together under a less rigid code than nuns, and without being obliged to give up their private property.[k]

V. *Rites and Usages.*

(1.) Throughout the West, Latin had from the first been used as the language of Divine service. As it was spoken in all the western provinces of the empire, there was no necessity for translating the liturgy into other tongues; and, after the barbarian conquests, Latin remained as the language of superior civilisation, and especially as that of the clergy, whose ranks were for a long time generally filled from among the Romanized inhabitants.[m] It was the medium by which nations carried on their official intercourse;[n] it alone remained stable, while the dialects of the invaders were in a course of fluctuation and change; and, where new languages were formed on its basis—a process in which the ecclesiastical use of Latin contributed greatly to secure its predominance—the formation was gradual, so that it would have been impossible to fix on any time at which the ancient Roman tongue should have been disused as obsolete.[o] The closer connexion established with Rome by Pipin and Charlemagne confirmed the use of Latin in the Frank church. And thus an usage which originally arose out of circumstances, came at length to be regarded as necessary, and at a later time to be justified by theoretical argument,[p] although confessedly as contrary to the practice of the early

[j] Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 817, c. 21; (Pertz, Leges, i. 208;) Conc. Wormat. A.D. 829, c. 17 (ib. 343); Conc. Paris. A.D. 829, cc. 39, 44.

[k] Rettberg, ii. 697-8.

[m] Neander, v. 174-5. See vol. i. p. 505.

[n] Milman, vi. 378.

[o] Schmidt, i. 183; Milman, i. 403; ii. 426. On the gradual corruption of Latin, see Hist. Litt. i. 27, seqq.; Hallam, M. A. ii. 340-351.

[p] Neander, v. 175. Fleury (Disc. ii. 23) and Dr. Lingard (A. S. C. i. 308) allege, in favour of Latin service, that, but for the necessity of learning the language for this purpose, the clergy of the dark ages would have altogether neglected it, and consequently would have allowed the remains both of pagan and of Christian antiquity to perish. This argument from a supposed result, whatever it may be worth in itself, has obviously nothing to do with the justification of using an unknown tongue in service—much less of retaining it, when the dark ages were at an end.

church[q] as it appears to be to reason. Charlemagne, however, notwithstanding his attachment to the Roman ritual, combated the growing opinion on this point. "Let no one," it is said in his capitulary at the council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), "suppose that God may not be prayed to except in three languages; forasmuch as in every tongue God is worshipped, and man is heard if he ask the things which are right."[r]

The chanting was now left to the choir, and the people joined only in the *Kyrie eleëson*.[s] But Charlemagne and others were careful that preaching—which by means of missions regained an importance which it had once appeared likely to lose—should be frequent, and in the vulgar tongue.[t] His measures for the instruction of the people in the Creed and the Lord's Prayer have been noticed in a former chapter.[u]

In England, Latin was used as the language of Divine service, not only by Augustine and his followers, but by the Scotch and Irish teachers, who had been accustomed to it in their native churches.[x] The Epistle and Gospel, however, were read in the vernacular tongue, and in it sermons were delivered.[y] The Scotch or Irish liturgy was suppressed by the council of Cloveshoe in those parts of southern England where it had before been used;[z] but, notwithstanding the influence of Wilfrid, it kept possession of the church of York until the time of Alcuin, who is found recommending that it should be abandoned.[a] It would, however, seem that, in the adaptation of the Roman ritual for England, some use was made of that license of selection from other quarters which had been granted by Gregory to Augustine.[b]

In the East, Greek had been the usual language of the Church, and continued to be so under the Mahometan rule, where Arabic

[q] Martene, i. 101.

[r] C. 52; Pertz, Leges, i. 75. M. Guizot supposes (ii. 226) that the languages meant are Greek, Latin, and *German*. But the very thing which is condemned is the prejudice against the use of German: the three languages were evidently those written over the cross, as appears further from the words of John VIII. in sanctioning the Slavonic liturgy. "Qui fecit tres linguas principales, Hebream, scilicet, Græcam, et Latinam, ipse creavit et alias omnes ad laudem et gloriam suam." Ep. 107, ap. Hard. vi. 86.

[s] Gieseler, ii. 279; Rettberg, ii. 779. There is a curious passage in the 27th canon of Cloveshoe, as to those who sing without understanding the words—exhorting them to suit their own thoughts and desires to them. See Johnson's note, i. 259.

[t] Conc. Arel. A.D. 813, c. 10, &c.; Rettberg, ii. 772-4. See above, p. 136. Such sermons of the time as remain are Latin; but they were either the originals or translations of the German or "rustic Roman," which was preached to the people. Rettberg, i. 775-7.

[u] See p. 134.

[x] Johnson, I. xiii.-xiv.; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 302.

[y] Lingard, i. 307-8.

[z] Cc. 13, 15 (A.D. 747).

[a] Ep. 171, ad Symeonem.

[b] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 294-5. (See p. 18.)

was used for the ordinary business of life. The Monophysites of Egypt, however, employed the Coptic in their service, and the Nestorians the Syriac.[c]

(2.) The use of organs was now brought into Divine service. It has been generally supposed that one sent by Constantine Copronymus to Pipin, in 757,[d] was the first which was seen in the west; but Aldhelm and Bede are evidences that the instrument was before known in England,[e] where, if a Greek invention,[f] it may possibly have been introduced by Theodore. The Franks became so skilful in the manufacture, that about a century after the date of Constantine's gift, Pope John VIII. is found requesting a bishop of Freisingen to send him an organ, as those of the north were superior to any that could be made in Italy.[g]

(3.) The history of the eucharistic doctrine during this period has been disputed with as much zeal and partiality as if the question between modern Rome and its opponents depended on the opinions of the seventh and eighth centuries. The word *figure*, when it occurs, is hailed by one party, and such words as *body*, *blood*, or *changed*, by the other, as if they were sufficient to determine the matter. But the truth seems to lie between the extremes. Both in language and in opinion there was a progress towards the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the feeling of individuals may have closely bordered on it; but there was no recognition, nor apparently even any assertion, of more than an effective grace, by which the consecrated elements, while retaining their original substance, convey to the faithful receiver the benefits of the Saviour's death. Some passages of Bede and of Alcuin, for example, which are produced by Romanists as favourable to their views,[h] appear really to maintain nothing beyond the doctrine of the English reformation; and when Alcuin speaks of a bishop's consecrating bread and wine into the *substance* of our Lord's body and blood,[k] it would seem that by "substance" he does not mean any thing material, but only a virtual efficacy. And after this, the Caroline Books, in which Alcuin himself is supposed to have been largely concerned, express themselves in a manner entirely accordant with our own eucharistic doctrine.[m]

[c] Fleury, Disc. ii. 7.
[d] Einhard. Annot. 757.
[e] Turner, iii. 457-8; Lingard, A. S. C. 375-6.
[f] Mabillon, III. lxxxii.
[g] A.D. 873. Schröckh, xix. 110.
[h] See Schröckh, xx. 164-5.
[k] Ep. 36, p. 19. Dr. Lingard, however, quotes the words as conclusive in favour of transubstantiation. A. S. C. ii. 465.
[m] *E. g.* ii. 27 (pp. 274-8); iv. 14 (pp. 419-420). The words which Dr. Lingard quotes from the latter passage (A. S. C. ii. 464) do not warrant this inference from them.

John of Damascus appears to have gone further than any of the western teachers. He rejects the term "figure," as unauthorised by Scripture, and declares the consecrated elements to be "the very deified body of the Lord."[n] Yet this startling expression may be reduced by a comparison with the language then current as to the union of our Lord's natures or wills—where it was said that the flesh or the human will was "deified" by its connexion with the Godhead.[o] If the meaning were more than this parallel would warrant—if John intended to maintain that the material elements were changed, instead of being united with something higher—it is certain that the eastern church did not adopt his view.[p] The Eucharist was mentioned in the controversy as to images by the hostile synods of Constantinople and Nicæa. The iconoclastic assembly declares that the only true image of the Saviour is the Eucharist—meaning that the union of the Divine grace with the earthly elements represents that union of Godhead and manhood in his person, which images failed to convey, inasmuch as they could only set forth the humanity. The Nicene council, in answering this, finds fault with the term *image*, as being one which no father had applied to that which is His body and blood.[q] Yet no objection is made to the substance of the comparison; nor do we find anywhere in this controversy the distinction which must have occurred if the modern Roman doctrine had been then received—that the consecrated elements are unlike images, forasmuch as they are not a representation, but are really Christ Himself.[r]

Instead of the common bread in which the Eucharist had originally been administered, wafers were now substituted. They were

[n] De Fid. Orthod. iv. 12. (Opera, i. 271.)

[o] *E. g.* in the sixth general council it is said that the human will is "deified, not destroyed." (See p. 48.) See too l. iii. c. 17, of Damascene's own work, where he explains how Christ's flesh can be said to be "deified"—that it is not by any change or confusion, but merely by union, the two natures remaining entire and distinct. I have, however, some doubt as to the possibility of clearing the passage in the text by this parallel. There would be no difficulty if he had said that the bread and wine are deified; but instead of this he says that they *are* the deified *body*.

[p] Schröckh, xx. 174.

[q] Hard. iv. 368-372. That this assertion was untrue, see Schröckh, xx. 161-3.

[r] Schröckh, xx. 592 (from Rössler's Bibl. d. Kirchenväter). During this period there are many tales of miracles in which the consecrated host is said to have shed blood. (*e. g.* Greg. Turon. vi. 21, and frequent instances in Gregory the Great.) These might be supposed evidence of a belief in transubstantiation; but we find also in Gregory the Great (Ep. iv. 30) a story of a cloth which, having been applied to the body of a saint, shed blood on being cut. This cannot mean that the cloth had been changed into the saint's body, but only that the virtue of the body had been communicated to it; and the explanation will serve for the other cases.

of very fine flour, unleavened, round in shape, and stamped with an instrument.[s] The communion of infants appears to have been still in use,[t] and many superstitions were practised with the consecrated bread—such as giving it to the dead and burying it with them.[u] The cup continued until the twelfth century to be administered to all communicants.[x]

The height to which the idea of a sacrifice in the Eucharist was carried, now led to some important consequences. The sacrifice was supposed to avail not only for those who were present but for the absent; for the dead as well as for the living. One result of this was, that the obligation of receiving the sacrament was less felt, so that there is much complaint as to the rarity of communion, and that canons are passed for restoring the three receptions yearly which had been prescribed by the council of Agde.[y] At length masses came to be celebrated privately, and by the priest alone.[z] This practice was forbidden by Theodulf of Orleans;[a] it is censured, although not in absolute terms, by the council of Mentz in 813,[b] and is more decidedly condemned by the sixth council of Paris, in 829.[c]

From the time of Gregory the Great, the doctrine of Purgatory spread and was developed. In the English church, the offspring of Gregory's own exertions, it appears to have especially taken root. Bede relates stories of persons who had been transported in vision to the regions of the dead; they returned to consciousness with a sad and awestruck air, told their tale, and soon after died. Thus Fursey[d] and Drithelm[e] were permitted to see the punishments of hell and purgatory, and the bliss of the righteous who were awaiting their consummation in paradise. The vision of Drithelm was versified by Alcuin; other narratives of the same kind appeared, the idea of such visions become familiar to men's minds, and, six centuries later, the dreams of the obscure Irish or Northumbrian monks issued in the great poem of the middle ages.[f]

[s] Mabill. III. xxxv.-xl., xlv. seqq.; Rettberg, ii. 786-7.

[t] Schröckh, xx. 175. See, however, Waterland, vi. 67, ed. Oxf. 1843; and vol. i. p. 155.

[u] This is forbidden by Conc. Trull. A.D. 691, c. 83.

[x] Mabill. III. liii.-lv.

[y] A.D. 506. See vol. i. p. 515. Comp. Bed. Ep. ad Egbert. 9; Conc. Turon. A.D. 813, c. 50, &c.

[z] Schröckh, xx. 176-180; Rettberg, ii. 785; Gieseler, II. i. 156.

[a] Capit. 7, ap. Hard. iv. 914.

[b] "Ut nobis videtur." c. 43.

[c] C. 48. The capitulary of 789 forbids another irregularity—consecration without the priest's communicating. C. 6; Pertz, Leges, i. 55.

[d] Bed. iii. 19.

[e] Ib. v. 12. Other stories are in the chapters 13-4.

[f] Palgrave, Norm. and England, i. 72; Ampère, ii. 365; iii. 121-2. The vision of Wettin (see p. 127), in the ninth century, marks, as M. Ampère observes, an

With the belief in purgatory, that in the utility of masses for the departed grew. Fraternities were formed, especially among monks, to say a certain number of masses for the soul of every brother at his death, and on the anniversary of it, or to provide for the purchase of them by a payment, which in England was called *soulscot*.[g] The performance of such masses became an important source of income to the clergy, and is recognised as such by Chrodegang's rule.[h] Additional altars were on this account erected in churches, which before had only one.[i] Masses were also used in order to obtain temporal benefits, such as fair weather or seasonable rain.[k]

(4.) A greater strictness in the observance of the Lord's-day had gradually been introduced into the church.[m] Many canons throughout this period, and shortly after, enact that it should be kept by a cessation from all trade, husbandry, or other manual labour. No lawcourts or markets may be held, men are to refrain from hunting, women must not sew, embroider, weave, card wool, beat flax, shear sheep, or *publicly* wash clothes.[n] No journeys were to be taken except such as were unavoidable; and these were to be so managed as not to interfere with the duty of attending the church-service.[o] Theodore of Canterbury states that the Greeks and the Latins agree in doing no work on Sunday; that they do not sail, ride, drive, except to church, hawk, or bathe; that the Greeks do not write in public on the day, although at home they write according to their convenience.[p] The laws of the West Saxon king Ina (A.D. 688-725) enact that if a serf work on the Lord's-day by his master's order, he shall be free; if at his own will, he shall pay a fine or shall "suffer in his hide."[q] The council of Berghamstead (A.D. 696) enacts that a freeman breaking the rest of the day shall undergo the *healsfang*,[r] and

important step in the progress towards Dante—the introduction of political matters into such narratives, and the employment of them as vehicles of personal reproof.

[g] Mabillon, III. lxxxvi. seqq.; Soames, A. S. C. 282; Rettberg, ii. 788-9.

[h] C. 32; see Mabillon, III. xliii.

[i] Mabillon, III. lv.-lvi.

[k] Schröckh, xx. 182; Rettberg, ii. 788.

[m] See vol. i. p. 321.

[n] Greg. Ep. ix. 1; Conc. Cabil. I. A.D. 650, c. 18; Conc. Clovesh. A.D. 747, c. 14; Capit. A.D. 789, c. 80 (Pertz, Leges, i. 66); Conc. Foroj. A.D. 691, c. 13; Theodulph. Cap. 24 (Hard. iv. 917); Conc. Arel. A.D. 813, c. 16; Conc. Cabil. A.D. 813, c. 50; Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 37; Laws of Northumbrian Priests, in Thorpe, 421, No. 55, &c.

[o] The council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 836, suggests that marriages should not be celebrated on Sunday, iii. 18.

[p] Theod. Capit. 7. (Hard. iii. 1773.)

[q] C. 3, in Thorpe, 45; Comp. Laws of Edward and Guthrum, c. 7, ib. 73.

[r] *Healsfang*—*i. e.* a *neck-catch*—properly a sort of pillory; but as this was very early disused, the word came to mean a fine or pecuniary commutation for the ignominy, graduated according to the offender's rank. See Thorpe, Glossary to Ancient Laws and Institutes.

imposes a heavy fine on a master who shall make his servant work between the sunset of Saturday and that of Sunday.[s] The authority of pretended revelations was called in to enforce the observance of the Lord's-day. Charlemagne, in 789, orders the suppression of a letter which was said to have fallen from heaven in the preceding year, and of which it appears that this was the object;[t] and the same pious fraud, or something of the same kind, was employed in England.[u] Under Louis the Pious, councils are found speaking of judgments by which persons had been punished for working on the Lord's-day—some had been struck by lightning, some lamed in their members, some reduced to ashes by visible fire. The clergy, the nobles, and the emperor himself, are desired to show a good example by a right observance of the day.[x]

But the idea of identifying the Lord's-day with the Jewish sabbath was condemned. Gregory the Great speaks of it as a doctrine of Antichrist, who is to require the observance of both days—of the Sabbath, for the sake of Judaism; of the Lord's-day, because he will pretend to rival the Saviour's resurrection. Gregory goes on to notice the scruples of some who held that it was wrong to wash the body on the Lord's-day. It is allowed, he says, for necessity, although not for luxury, and he adds a curious attempt at Scriptural proof.[y] The councils of Lestines and Verne censure an extreme rigour in the observance of the day, as "belonging rather to Jewish superstition than to Christian duty."[z]

The Lord's-day was commonly considered to begin on Saturday evening, and to reach to the corresponding hour on Sunday.[a] Such, as we have seen, was the length of the labourer's rest in England at the time of the council of Berghamstead (A.D. 696); but by the middle of the tenth century it was extended, and reached from nones (3 P.M.) on Saturday to the dawn of Monday.[b]

(5.) The festival of All Saints has been generally connected with the beginning of this period, when Boniface IV. obtained a grant of the Pantheon at Rome from Phocas, and consecrated it as the church of St. Mary *ad Martyres* in 607.[c] It would, however, appear that a festival of martyrs, on May 13, which arose out

[s] C. 10-12; Thorpe, 17. The place of this council is supposed to have been Berstead, near Maidstone.

[t] Comp. 77. See above, p. 103, note [b].

[u] Soames, A. S. C. 257.

[x] Conc. Paris. VI. A.D. 829, l. i. 50; l. iii. 19; Conc. Wormat. A.D. 829, c. 11. (Pertz, Leges, i. 342.)

[y] Ep. xiii. 1.

[z] Conc. Liptin. A.D. 743 (Hard. iii. 1924-6); Conc. Vern. A.D. 755, c. 14 (Pertz, Leges, i. 26).

[a] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 15 (Pertz, Leges, i. 57); Conc. Francof. A.D. 794, c. 21.

[b] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 310-1.

[c] Anastas. 135; Baron. 607. 1.

of the consecration of the Pantheon, has been confounded with All Saints' Day (Nov. 1), and that the latter was not observed at Rome until the eighth century.[d] In the east, the Sunday after Whitsunday had been connected with the memory of All Saints as early as the time of St. Chrysostom.[e]

The growing reverence for the Blessed Virgin led to an increase of festivals dedicated to her. The Presentation in the Temple became the Purification of St. Mary. In Spain, the appearance vouchsafed to Ildefonsus of Toledo occasioned the establishment of the "Expectation of St. Mary" (Dec. 18).[f] The Assumption (Aug. 15) was also now introduced. In the silence of Scripture as to the Blessed Virgin's death, legends on the subject had arisen. At the time of the council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), she was supposed to have spent her last years with St. John in that city, and to have been interred in the church where the council met. But afterwards it came to be believed that she had been buried in the valley of Jehoshaphat, and thence had been caught up to heaven. From this tale, which originated in a conjecture of Epiphanius, and was afterwards supported by sermons falsely ascribed to Jerome and Augustine, the festival of the Assumption took its rise.[g] In one of the Capitularies it is mentioned as a subject for inquiry;[h] but the observance of it is sanctioned by the Council of Mentz, in 813.[i] The other festivals named in the same canon are—Easter with the week following, Ascension-day, Whitsunday and the week after it, St. Peter and St. Paul, the Nativity of St. John Baptist, St. Michael, St. Remigius, St. Martin, St. Andrew, four days at Christmas, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Purification, the dedication of each church, and the feasts of the martyrs and confessors whose relics are preserved in the diocese or parish.[k] This last provision contained the germ of a great multiplication of festivals, which naturally ensued as saints of local fame became more generally celebrated, and as their relics were more widely dispersed.[m]

The Council of Mentz also sanctions the celebration of the Ember-weeks,[n] which was now generally established.

(6.) The superstitions connected with an excess of reverence

[d] Gieseler, II. i. 160-1. See Martene, i. 215.

[e] Gieseler, l. cit.

[f] See above, p. 58; Baron. 657. 56, and Pagi, xi. 509; Martene, i. 199.

[g] Gieseler, II. i. 157-160.

[h] "Interrogandum relinquimus." Annegis, Capitul. i. 158, ed. Baluze, i. 732.

[i] C. 36.

[k] "Parochia." See an English list in Alford's Laws, c. 43; Thorpe, 40-1.

[m] Schröckh, xx. 140.

[n] C. 34.

for saints were continually on the increase. Stories of visions in which saints appeared, and of miracles performed by them, are found in immense profusion—so great, indeed, that even some contemporaries began to murmur. Thus we are told by the biographer of Hildulph, abbot of Moyen-Moutier, in the Vosges,[o] who died in 707, that the death of one of his monks named Spinulus was followed by a number of miracles. Three mineral springs burst forth in the abbey-garden, and crowds of people were attracted to the place. Hildulph understood the advantages which his house was likely to derive from the offerings of pilgrims; but he feared that the monks might be drawn away from their proper work to attend to earthly business: he therefore knelt down at the tomb of Spinulus, and, after having thanked God for the assurance of his brother's beatification, charged the deceased monk, by the obedience which he had owed him while alive, to save the society from the threatened danger. Spinulus complied; the springs dried up, and the miracles ceased.[p] Other stories might be produced, which show that some persons felt the general craving after miracles to be unwholesome in its effects, even where they did not venture to question the reality of the wonders which were reported.[q]

The passion for relics was more and more developed. The second Council of Nicæa orders that no church should be consecrated without some relics, and imputes a disregard of them to the opponents of images;[r] but these, as we have seen,[s] were anxious to relieve themselves of the odium. Relics of our Lord and of the Blessed Virgin, the most precious of all, were multiplied. The seamless coat and the napkin which had bound the Saviour's head in the sepulchre were each supposed to be preserved in more than one place.[t] Among the treasures of the abbey of Centulles, under Angilbert, who died in 801, were fragments of the manger in which our Lord was laid, of the candle lighted at his birth, of his vesture and sandals, of the rock on which He sat when He fed the five thousand, of the wood of the three tabernacles, of the bread which He gave to his disciples, of the cross, and of the

[o] He is said, but untruly, to have resigned the archbishopriek of Trèves before retiring to this monastery. Rettberg, ii. 467-9, 523.

[p] Vit. Hildulph. ap. Mabillon, iv. 478-9.

[q] See Mabillon, III. lxxxviii.; Schröckh, xx. 116-7. Amulo, bishop of Lyons, about the middle of the ninth century, speaks of pretended miracles, and of impostures practised by pretended demóniacs. (Inter Opera Agobardi, ii. 142-3.)

[r] C. 7.

[s] Pp. 91, 152.

[t] Schröckh, xx. 121-4.

sponge; with portions of the Virgin's milk, of her hair, her dress, and her cloak.[u] In honour of the Cross were instituted the festivals of its Invention and Exaltation.[x]

Other relics also were diligently sought for, and were highly prized. Not only are saints said to have appeared, as in former ages, for the purpose of pointing out the resting-places of their remains,[y] but it is said that sometimes, in answer to earnest prayer, relics were sent down from heaven.[z] A great impulse was given to this kind of superstition when, on the approach of the Lombards to Rome, in 761, Pope Paul removed the bodies of saints from their tombs outside the city to churches within the walls.[a] The Frankish records of the time abound in accounts of the translation of relics to various places in France, and of the solemnities with which they were received.[b] The very connexion with Rome was supposed to confer a sanctity and a miraculous power. Thus it is related that Odo, duke of Aquitaine, a contemporary of Charles Martel, having got possession of three sponges which had been used in wiping the pope's table, divided them into little morsels, which he caused his soldiers to swallow before a battle; that no one of those who had partaken was

[u] Vita S. Angilberti, c. 9, ap. Mabillon, v. 113-4.

[x] Schröckh, xx. 120.

[y] Thus Anastasius tells us that when Pope Paschal (A.D. 817-824) had built a church, St. Cecilia opportunely appeared to him, assuring him that, although the Lombards under Aistulf had sought for her body, the vulgar belief of their having found it was quite incorrect, and that the discovery was reserved for him, in order to the enrichment of his new church. 216.

[z] Schröckh, xx. 125.

[a] Anastas. 173.

[b] In answer to the archchaplain Furrow, who had asked for the body of a saint, Pope Adrian tells him that he had been deterred by revelations from disturbing any more bodies, but informs him where one which had formerly been granted might perhaps be obtained. (Bouquet, v. 560.) Among Einhard's works (ii. 176-377, ed. Teulet) is a tract on the translation of two saints named Marcellinus and Peter (A.D. 829), which gives a very curious view of the practices of relic-hunters and of the superstitions connected with the veneration of relics. Einhard's agents stole the bodies by night from a church at Rome—an act which appears to have been regarded as quite lawful in such cases. (See vol. i. p. 325.) Of the miracles which followed, one specimen may be given. A deacon, who was charged to convey a portion of the relics as a present from Einhard to a monastery, stopped to feed his horses in a meadow. Forthwith the occupier of the land appeared—a hunchback, whose face was swollen by violent toothache—armed with a pitchfork, and beside himself with rage on account of the trespass. In answer to his outcries, the deacon told him that he would do better to kneel down before the relics, and pray for the cure of his toothache. The man laid down his pitchfork, and obeyed; and when he rose up, after a few minutes, his face was reduced to its natural size, and he was freed not only from his toothache but from his deformity (pp. 328-330). St. Wilibrord dealt more severely with a churl who remonstrated against a similar trespass. He deprived him of the power of drinking, and the man suffered horribly until the Saint, on revisiting the place after a year, released him. Vita S. Willibr. ap. Mabill. iii. 612-3.

wounded, and that while 375,000 Saracens were slain in one day, his own losses throughout the war amounted only to 1500 men.[c]

Charlemagne repeatedly condemns some ecclesiastical superstitions as well as those of the heathens whom he subdued. He forbids the veneration of fictitious saints and doubtful martyrs;[d] the invocation or worship of any but such as the Church had sanctioned, or the erection of memorials to them by the way-side;[e] the circulation of apocryphal or questionable narratives;[f] the introduction of new names of angels, in addition to those for which there is authority—Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael.[g] The council of Mentz forbids the translation of the bodies of saints, unless with permission from the sovereign and the bishops.[h]

Legendary lives of saints were now produced in wonderful abundance, and were the most popular literature of the times. In addition to their falsehood[i] (which, where consciously introduced, may have been held excusable by the writers for the sake of the expected good effects), and to their enforcement of all the errors which had grown upon the Church, they carried the minds of men to look for visible prosperity and chastisement according to individual desert in the ordinary government of the world.[k] Yet the evil of such legends was not without a large compensation of good. They set forth the power of religion, not only in miracles but in self-denial and renunciation of the world. In contrast with the rudeness and selfishness which generally prevailed, they presented examples which taught a spirit of gentleness and self-sacrifice, of purity, of patience, of love to God and man, of disinterested toil,

[c] Anastas. 155.

[d] Capit. A.D. 789, c. 42. (Pertz, Leges, i. 60.)

[e] Capit. Francof. A.D. 794, c. 42. (ib. 74.)

[f] Cap. A.D. 789, c. 77.

[g] Ib. c. 16. This professes to be from a canon of Laodicea, A.D. 372? c. 35, which, however, prohibits *all* invocation of angels. The new turn given to the prohibition may have been intended against such teachers as Adelbert. (See above, p. 103.) Among other superstitions which are forbidden were the baptising of bells (Cap. A.D. 789, c. 69), the practices of divination and sortilege (ib. c. 68), and the employment of charms against sickness in men or in cattle. Conc. Turon. A.D. 813, c. 42.

[h] C. 51. (813.)

[i] I must confess my inability to accept M. Ampère's definition of the legend—"Ce récit, souvent merveilleux, *que personne ne fabrique sciemment, et que tout le monde altère et falsifie sans le savoir.*" (i. 310-1; cf. ii. 355-6.) M. Alfred Maury, in his 'Essai sur les Légendes Pieuses du Moyen-Age' (Paris, 1843)—an able and learned book, but written on the principles of Strauss—traces the fictions of the hagiologists to three causes—1. The attempt to assimilate the lives of their subjects to that of our Lord or to those of Scripture saints. 2. The mistake of understanding literally things which were said in a figurative sense—*e. g.*, where a spiritual was represented as a bodily cure. 3. The invention of stories in order to explain symbols of which the real meaning had been lost.

[k] Fleury, Disc. ii. 3.

of forgiveness to enemies, of kindness to the poor and the oppressed. The concluding part of the legend exhibited the saint triumphant after his earthly troubles, yet still interested in his brethren who were engaged in the struggle of life, and manifesting his interest by interpositions in their behalf. And above all there was the continual inculcation of a Providence watching over all the events of the world, ready to protect the innocent, or to recompense and to avenge their sufferings.[m]

(7.) Even as early as the fourth century, some of the evils attendant on the general practice of pilgrimage had been noticed by Gregory of Nyssa and others;[n] and strong complaints of a like kind continue to be found from time to time. Gregory the Great tells Rusticiana, a lady of the imperial court, that, while she had been on a pilgrimage to Sinai, her affections had been at Constantinople, and expresses a suspicion that the holy objects which she had seen with her bodily eyes had made no impression on her heart.[o] But the idle spirit in which pilgrimages were often undertaken was not the worst mischief connected with them. Boniface writes to Archbishop Cuthbert, that of the multitude of English women who flocked to Rome, only a few escaped the ruin of their virtue; that it was rare to find a town of Lombardy or France in which some dishonoured English nun or other female pilgrim had not taken up her abode, and by her misconduct brought disgrace on the church of her native land.[p] Another unhappy effect of pilgrimage was, that for the sake of it bishops and abbots absented themselves for years from their proper spheres of labour, to the great injury of religion and discipline among those committed to their care.[q]

From Britain, pilgrimages were most commonly made to Rome, where the English had a quarter of their own, known, as the biographer of the popes inform us, by the Saxon name of *the Burg*.[r] Some pilgrims from our island even found their way to the Holy Land. In France, the chief place of pilgrimage was the shrine of St. Martin, at Tours; but the resort from that country to Rome became greater after the accession of the Carolingian dynasty. The lives of pilgrims were regarded as sacred; many hospitals were built for their reception.[s] Charlemagne in 802 orders that

[m] Guizot, Lecture 17; Löbell, Gregor v. Tours, 388; Ampère, ii. 360; Stephen's Lectures, i. 142.

[n] Vol. i. p. 328.

[o] Ep. iv. 46.

[p] Ep. 63 (i. 146, ed. Giles, or in Bede, ed. Hussey, 351).

[q] Fleury, Disc. ii. 5.

[r] Anastas. 214.

[s] Capit. Langobard. A.D. 782, c. 10. (Pertz, i. 44.)

no one, whether rich or poor, shall refuse them a roof, fire, and water, and encourages those who can afford more to greater hospitality by a consideration of the recompense which Scripture promises.[t] There are, however, canons against some of the abuses connected with pilgrimage. The Council of Verne, in 755, orders that monks shall not be allowed to wander to Rome without their abbot's consent.[u] The Council of Châlons-sur-Saône, in 813, forbids the clergy to go either to Rome or to Tours without leave from their bishop; and while it acknowledges the benefit of pilgrimage for those who have confessed their sins and have obtained directions for penance, who amend their lives, give alms, and practise devotion, it denounces the error of such as consider pilgrimage a license to sin, and begs the emperor to take measures against a common practice of nobles who extorted from their dependents the means of paying the expense of their pilgrimages.[x]

In some cases, persons who had been guilty of grievous sin were condemned by way of penance to leave their country, and either to wander for a time, or to undertake a pilgrimage to some particular place.[y] Many of them were loaded with chains, or with rings which ate into the flesh and inflicted excessive torture.[z] Ethelwulf, the father of Alfred the Great, at his visit to Rome in 855, obtained from Benedict III. the privilege that no Englishman should ever be obliged to this sort of penance;[a] but long before his time impostors had found their account in going naked and in irons under the pretence of having been sentenced to pilgrimage. The capitulary of 789 forbids such vagabonds to roam about the country, and suggests that those who have really been guilty of some great and unusual offence may perform their penance better by remaining in one place.[b]

(8.) The discipline of the Church in dealing with sin was now regulated by Penitential Books. These books were of eastern origin; the earliest of them was drawn up by John, patriarch of Constantinople, the antagonist of Gregory the Great;[c] the first in the western church was that of Theodore, the Greek archbishop of Canterbury, which soon gained a great authority in the continental

[t] Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 802, c. 27. (Pertz, i. 94.)
[u] C. 10. (Pertz, i. 26.)
[x] Cc. 44-5.
[y] Notices of this are found as early as Gregory of Tours, in the end of the 6th century. Martene, i. 268.
[z] Neander, v. 193.
[a] Lingard, H. E. i. 177.
[b] C. 78 (Pertz, Leges, i. 66). To the same purpose is Capit. A.D. 802, c. 45 (ib. 100).
[c] Schröckh, xx. 146-7. For the western Penitentials, see Walter, Kirchenrecht, 179-182.

churches as well as in England.[d] The object of Theodore was to reduce penance to something practicable, as the impossibility of fulfilling the requirements of the ancient canons had led to a general evasion or disregard of them.[e] While the penalties now were at least as severe as in earlier times, a system of commutation was introduced; for example, a certain amount of fasting might be redeemed by the recitation of a prescribed number of psalms. From this the transition was easy to a system of pecuniary commutations[f]—a system recommended by the analogy of the *wehr*.[g] That institution had been extended from its original character of a composition for life to the case of lesser bodily injuries, so that the loss of a limb, of an eye, of a finger, or of a tooth was to be atoned for by a fixed pecuniary fine;[h] and the principle was now introduced into the penitentials, where offences were rated in a scale both of exercises and of money nearly resembling that of the civil damages. As yet, however, these payments were not regarded as a source of profit to the Church, but were to be given to the poor, according to the penitent's discretion.[i] In England, the rich were able to relieve themselves in their penance by associating with themselves a number of poor persons for the performance of it. By such means, it was possible to clear off seven years of penitence within a week; and, although the practice was condemned by the Council of Cloveshoe,[k] it was afterwards sanctioned.[m]

The necessary effect of the new penitential system was not only to encourage the fatal error of regarding money as an equivalent for sin—an error against which some councils protested in vain,[n] while the language of others seems to countenance it[o]—but to introduce a spirit of petty traffic into the relations of sinners with their God. In opposition to this spirit Gregory III. said that canons ought not to lay down exactly the length of time which

[d] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 335. It is in Thorpe, 277, seqq.

[e] Planck, ii. 292; Rettberg, ii. 740.

[f] Theodore, in Thorpe, 309-310, 345, Egbert, c. 2 (Wilkins, i. 115); Lingard, A. S. C. 335-7.

[g] Planck, ii. 296; Rettberg, ii. 737, 741-2. See above, p. 194.

[h] See Alfred's Laws, in Thorpe, 41-4.

[i] Planck, ii. 330; Rettberg, ii. 741-2; Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, 661-4. Götting. 1828.

[k] A.D. 747, c. 27.

[m] Turner, iii. 86; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 338-9. See the chapter "Of powerful Men" in Edgar's canons (Thorpe, 414-5); the conclusion is—"This is the alleviation of the penance of a man powerful, and rich in friends; but one not possessing means may not so proceed, but must seek it in himself the more diligently; and that is also justest, that every one avenge his own misdeeds on himself, with diligent *bôt* (compensation). Scriptum est enim, Quia unusquisque onus suum portabit."

[n] Conc. Clovesh. c. 26; Conc. Cabil. A.D. 813, c. 36.

[o] Conc. Agath. A.D. 506, c. 6; Conc. Matisc. (585), c. 4. The Capit. Aquisgr. A.D. 816, c. 1, speaks of "pretia peccatorum."

should be assigned to penance for each offence, forasmuch as that which avails with God is not the measure of time but of sorrow.[p] The Council of Châlons denounces the penitential books, of which it says that "the errors are certain and the authors uncertain;" it charges them with "sewing pillows to all arm-holes," and requires that penance should be restored to the footing of the ancient canons;[q] and there are similar passages in other French councils of the ninth and tenth centuries.[r]

Confession of secret sins was much insisted on; but the priest was regarded rather as an adviser than as a judge, and the form of his absolution was not judicial but deprecatory.[s] Absolution was usually given immediately after confession, and the prescribed penance was left to be performed afterwards, so that, whereas in earlier ages the penitents had been excluded for a time from the full communion of the Church, they now remained in it throughout.[t]

The penalty of excommunication became in the Frankish church much more severe than it had formerly been. The Council of Verne (A.D. 755) lays down that an excommunicate person "must not enter the church, nor partake of food or drink with any Christian; neither may any one receive his gifts, or kiss him, or join with him in prayer, or salute him."[u] It has been supposed that the new terrors of this sentence were borrowed from the practice of the Druids,[x] with a view to controlling the rude converts who would have disregarded a purely spiritual penalty. The power of wielding it must doubtless have added greatly to the influence of the clergy, although this effect did not yet appear so fully as at a later period.

(9.) The trial of guilt or innocence by means of a solemn appeal to heaven had been practised among many heathen nations, including those of the north.[y] The Mosaic law had sanctioned it in certain cases;[z] it fell in with the popular appetite for miracles,[a] and the Church now for a time took the management of such trials into her own hands. The *Ordeal*, or *Judgment of God*,[b] was

[p] Hard. iii. 1870.

[q] A.D. 813, c. 38.

[r] Giesceler, II. i. 168. On the evil of the penitentials, see Martineau, 234-5; on the good which they were able to effect in such ages, there is an eloquent passage in Milman, i. 404-8.

[s] Bingham, xix. ii. 5-6; Rettberg, ii. 738.

[t] Planck, ii. 316.

[u] A.D. 755, c. 9 (Pertz, i. 25).

[x] Mosheim, ii. 135.

[y] Sophocl. Antig. 264-7. ἥμεν δ' ἔτοιμοι καὶ μύδρους αἴρειν χεροῖν, κ. τ. λ. Other instances are collected by Grimm, Rechtsalterthümer, 93.

[z] As in the trial of jealousy, Numb. v.; and in the casting of lots, Josh. vii.

[a] Planck, iii. 540.

[b] *Ordeal* is the same with the modern German *Urtheil*, judgment.

not to be resorted to where the guilt of an accused person was clear, but in cases of suspicion, where evidence was wanting or insufficient. The appeal was conducted with great solemnity. The accuser swore to the truth of his charge; the accused (who for three days had been preparing himself by fasting and prayer) asserted his innocence in the same manner; and he was adjured in the most awful terms not to approach the Lord's table if he were conscious of any guilt in the matter which was to be submitted to the Divine judgment. Both parties then communicated; and after this, the clergy anointed the instruments with which the trial was to be made.[c]

The ordeal was of various kinds. That by *wager of battle*[d] was introduced into the Burgundian law by the Arian king Gundobald, the contemporary of Clovis, against the remonstrances of Avitus, bishop of Vienne.[e] It was not uncommon among the Franks, but appears to have been unknown in England until after the Norman conquest.[f] In the trial by *hot iron*, the accused walked barefoot over heated ploughshares,[g] or (which was the more usual form), he carried a piece of glowing iron in his hand nine times the length of his foot. The foot or the hand (as the case might be) was then bound up and sealed. On the third day it was examined, and according to its appearance the guilt or innocence of the party was decided.[h] The trial of *hot water* consisted in plunging the arm into a boiling cauldron, and taking out a stone, a ring, or a piece of iron, which was hung at a greater or less depth in proportion to the gravity of the offence in question.[i] That of *cold water* was performed by throwing the accused into a

[c] A collection of forms used in the ordeal is given by Bouquet, v. 595-609, from Baluze's edition of the Capitularies. See too Martene, ii. 332. The fullest code is in Athelstan's laws, A.D. 928 (which may be found in Thorpe); Planck, iii. 540.

[d] See Grimm, 927.

[e] Agobard. adv. Legem Gundob. c. 13; contra Judicium Dei, c. 5.

[f] Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 136.

[g] Grimm, 914.

[h] Grimm, 915; Lingard, ii. 136. There is a question how this trial could ever have been successfully borne. Mr. Sommes supposes that the hand was fortified against the heat by some sort of preparation, and that this, with the shortness of the distance, and the interval of three days before inspection, might be enough to account for it (A. S. C. 293). Mr. Hallam, although less confidently, suggests a like explanation (M. A. ii. 359). Grimm (911), and Rettberg (ii. 753), say that the trial was very rarely made, and only in the case of persons against whom the popular feeling would be strong if they failed. Freemen might clear themselves by their own oaths, or by that of compurgators (Grimm, 911; Kemble, i. 210); so that the ordeal would be left to slaves (Martene, ii. 331), and to such women as could not find a champion. This explanation, however, does not at all account for success. Planck says that in all recorded cases the issue of these ordeals was favourable, and supposes that the clergy employed a pious fraud, to save the lives of innocent persons; iii. 543-6.

[i] Grimm, 919; Lingard, ii. 135.

pond. If he were laden with weights, sinking was a proof of guilt; if not, it was held to prove his innocence.[k] In the ordeal of the *cross* (which, notwithstanding the name which it acquired, was probably of heathen origin),[m] the accused or his proxy held up the right arm, or both arms. Psalms were sung during the trial, and the sinking or trembling of the arms was evidence of guilt.[n] Among other kinds of ordeal were—holding the hand in fire; walking in a single thin garment through a burning pile;[o] eating a cake, which in England was called the *corsned*;[p] or receiving the holy eucharist.[q]

Some of these practices were condemned after a time. Louis the Pious, after having in 816 prescribed the trial of the cross as a means of deciding between contradictory witnesses,[r] abolished it in the following year, "lest that which hath been glorified by the passion of Christ should through any man's rashness be brought to contempt."[s] Under the same emperor, the ordeal of cold water was forbidden in 829.[t] Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, a strenuous opponent of popular superstitions, addressed to Louis two tracts against the judicial combat.[u] He reflects on the heresy of the Burgundian king who had sanctioned it.[x] He denounces such duels as unchristian, and as involving a breach of charity more important than any good which could be expected from them.[y] He argues that, if truth might be thus ascertained, all judges are superfluous;[z] that the system holds out a premium to brute strength and to perjury; that the idea of its efficacy is contrary to Scripture, since we are there taught to despise the success of this world—since God suffers his saints to be slain, and has allowed believing nations to be overcome by unbelievers and heretics;[a] and he appeals to instances in which the vanity of such trials had been

[k] Grimm, 523; Rettberg, ii. 751. Hincmar (i. 605) combats the objection raised by the opponents of ordeals, that (when there were no weights) the guilty ought to sink, and the innocent to swim.

[m] Grimm, 926.

[n] Capit. A.D. 779, c. 10 (Pertz, i. 37); Pagi, xiii. 112.

[o] Grimm, 912. Of this we shall meet with instances hereafter.

[p] Laws of Cnut, No. 5 (Thorpe, 155); Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 132. The word is derived from *corse*, curse, and *snæde*, a piece or mouthful. Encyc. Britannica.

[q] Grimm, 932. A council at Worms, in 868, prescribes that for discovery of theft in a monastery all the monks should communicate (c. 15). But this was afterwards abolished as improper. Hard. n. in loc.

[r] This was by way of alternative, if they were not strong enough to fight with clubs and shields. The loser was to forfeit his right hand. Pertz, i. 195, c. 1.

[s] C. 27 (Pertz, i. 209).

[t] Capit. Wormat. c. 12 (ib. 352).

[u] Adv. Legem Gundobaldi; Contra Judicium Dei (Opera, t. i.)

[x] C. Jud. Dei, 5.

[y] Adv. L. Gundob. init.; C. Jud. Dei, 6-11.

[z] C. Jud. Dei, 5.

[a] Adv. Leg. Gund. 9.

manifested.[b] The ordeal, however, continued to be supported by the popular feeling, and the cause which Agobard had opposed soon after found a powerful champion in Hincmar.[c]

(13.) The privilege of *Asylum* in the Germanic kingdoms differed considerably from that which had existed under the Roman empire. It arose out of the ancient national usages; the object of it was not to bestow impunity on the criminal, but to protect him against hasty and irregular vengeance, to secure for him a legal trial, to afford the clergy an opportunity of interceding for him, and, if possible, of mitigating his punishment.[d] The operation of this institution was aided by the system of pecuniary composition for wrongs. The clergy were usually able to stipulate for the safety of the offender's life and limbs on condition that he should pay a suitable fine, or perhaps that he should submit to a course of penance.[e] Charlemagne in 779 limited the privilege by enacting that murderers or other capital offenders should not be allowed to take refuge in churches, and that, if they gained admittance, no food should be given to them.[f] According to the Roman idea of asylum, the prohibition of food would have been an impiety sufficient to draw down some judgment from the patron saint of a church; but it was not inconsistent with the German view.[g] The clergy, however, soon discovered a way of evading this law, by construing it as applicable to impenitent criminals only—*i. e.* to such as should refuse to confess to the priest, and to undergo ecclesiastical penance—a refusal which was not likely to be frequent, where it involved the choice between starvation and loss of sanctuary.[h] The prohibition of food does not appear in later enactments of the reign.[i]

The church could not fail to derive popularity from the privilege of offering shelter within its precincts against the lawlessness of

[b] Adv. Leg. Gund. 14.

[c] See below, Book II. c. ii. The third council of Valence, A.D. 855, ordered that persons who slew or hurt others in judicial combats should be put to penance as robbers and murderers; and that those slain in such combats should be excluded from the sacrifice of the mass and from Christian burial (Can. 12). It also condemned the custom of admitting contradictory oaths (c. 11). But the system of combats continued, and, as is well known, the English law sanctioned it down to the present century. Atto, bishop of Vercelli, in the tenth century, complains that clergymen and monks were obliged to undergo it by proxy. (Mabillon, VII. xix.)

[d] Planck, ii. 256; Grimm, Rechtsalterthümer, 886; Rettberg, ii. 745; Ozanam, 139.

[e] Schröckh, 471; Planck, ii. 257; Rettberg, ii. 746-7.

[f] C. 8. This is the Lombard form, which is clearer than the Frankish. See both in Pertz, i. 36.

[g] Rettberg, ii. 747.

[h] Schröckh, xix. 471; Planck, ii. 259-260.

[i] E. g. the additions to the Salic law, A. D. 803, c. 3 (Pertz, i. 113); Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, c. 39. It is, however, in Alfred's laws, c. 5; Thorpe, 29.

which the world without was then so full.[k] With a view of investing it with such popularity among his new subjects, Charlemagne ordered in his capitulary for Saxony (A.D. 785), that any person who should take sanctuary should, for the honour of God and his Church, be safe in life and limb, and should be unmolested until the next court-day, when he was to be sentenced to make suitable amends for his offence.[m] In legislating for the country after it had been reduced to a more settled state, this privilege was withdrawn, and the church was required to surrender up persons convicted of capital crimes.[n]

Among the Anglo-Saxons, the earliest law on the subject of asylum was that of Ina, in 696, which ordered that fugitives guilty of capital crimes should have their life protected by the church, but should be bound to make legal satisfaction; and that delinquents who had "put their hide in peril"—*i. e.* who had incurred the penalty of whipping—should be forgiven.[o] But the shelter of the church was only to be given for a certain time. The laws of Alfred (A.D. 877) limit it in some monasteries to three days;[p] it was, however, afterwards extended; and even in the same laws a longer privilege is allowed to other places.[q] Persons guilty of murder, treason, or crimes against religion, might ordinarily be dragged even from the altar; but some churches of especial sanctity, among which that of Croyland enjoyed the most extensive immunities, had the privilege of protecting all fugitives whatever.[r] The effect of such a privilege was probably felt as a serious hindrance to the execution of justice; for when Croyland, after having been laid waste by the Danes, was restored in the reign of Edred by his chancellor Turketul, the aged statesman declined a renewal of its ancient rights of sanctuary.[s]

VI. *Slavery.*

Instead of absolutely condemning slavery as an unlawful institution—a course which would probably have introduced anarchy into society, and would have raised a serious hindrance to the

[k] Planck, ii. 261; Hallam, M. A. ii. 366.

[m] C. 2. Pertz, i. 48.

[n] Rettberg, ii. 412, 748. In Alcuin's correspondence, there is much about a dispute between him and Theodulf of Orleans, on the subject of a convicted clerk, who escaped from Orleans and took refuge in St. Martin's abbey at Tours. The monks and the mob of Tours rose in his defence, and Alcuin incurred the displeasure of Charlemagne by supporting his brethren, who seem to have been altogether in the wrong. Epp. 118-9, 195.

[o] C. 5. Wilkins, i. 59; Thorpe, 46.

[p] C. 2. Thorpe, 28.

[q] C. 5. See Thorpe, 27-9; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 275.

[r] Lingard, A. S. C. i. 276.

[s] Ingulf. p. 40; Rer. Brit. Script. i. Oxf. 1684.

progress of the Gospel—the New Testament had been content to prepare the way for its gradual abolition by exhorting both master and slave to the performance of their mutual duties on the ground of their common brotherhood in Christ. And as yet the Church aimed only at a mitigation, not at an extinction, of slavery.

Servitude was of two kinds—that of slaves properly so called, and that of the *coloni*. The slaves were individually liable to removal and sale; they were incapable, under the Roman empire, of contracting a legitimate marriage,[t] and their property belonged to their master. The *coloni* were regarded as freeborn, so that, unlike slaves, they might become soldiers; they were attached to the soil, so that they could not be separated from it, nor could it be sold without them. They were capable of marriage and of possessing property; for the land which they cultivated, they paid a fixed rent, generally in kind, and they were subject to the land-tax and to a poll-tax.[u] It would, however, seem difficult to distinguish thoroughly between these classes in the canons which relate to the subject.

Theodore of Canterbury notes it as a point of difference between the eastern and the western monks, that, while the Latins have slaves, the Greeks have none.[x] The oriental monks themselves performed the labour which was elsewhere devolved on slaves; it was usual for persons entering on the monastic life to emancipate their slaves; and some teachers, as Isidore of Pelusium in the fifth century[y] and Theodore the Studite in the ninth, altogether questioned, or even denied, the lawfulness of having such property.[z] In the west there are occasional appearances of a like kind. Thus Wilfrid, on getting possession of the Isle of Selsey, emancipated all the serfs who were attached to the soil;[a] and Benedict of Aniane, whose ideas were chiefly drawn from the eastern monastic

[t] In the East, the marriage of slaves was only concubinage, till Basil the Macedonian (A.D. 867-886) altered the law, and his edict was not observed in practice (Biot, 213; Milman, i. 362). The barbarian codes, however, recognise it as proper marriage (Milman, i. 388). There are many regulations as to marriages between parties of various conditions, as to the effects of separation by sale, &c. E. g. Conc. Tolet. ix. A.D. 655, c 13; Theodor. Capit. 17; Egbert. Excerpt. 126; Conc. Vermer. A.D. 753, c. 6; Conc. Compend. A.D. 756, c. 5; Conc. Cabil. III. A.D. 813, c. 30.

[u] Guizot, iii. 125-133. Savigny, on the Roman Coloni, in Philolog. Museum, ii. 117-146. The coloni appear only in the later times of Rome, and the origin of the institution is unknown, Savigny, 145. See Guizot, 133.

[x] Capit. 8 (Hard. iii. 1773).

[y] Neander, v. 136.

[z] Planck, ii. 350. Theodore, in his will (p. 66, ed. Sirmond), forbids the abbot of his monastery to have slaves, since the use of them, as of marriage, is allowed to secular persons only. But the reason which he gives—that they are men, made in God's image—would hold equally against all slavery whatever.

[a] Beda, iv. 13.

rules, on receiving gifts of land for his monasteries, refused to accept the serfs with it.[b] Somewhat in the same spirit was the enactment of the council of Chalchythe in 816; that a bishop at his death should liberate such of his English slaves as had been reduced to bondage in his time.[c] But the usual practice of the west was different. In donations of land to the church, the slaves or coloni passed with the soil, as in other transfers.[d] Bishops were restrained by a regard for the property of their churches from emancipating the serfs who belonged to these; the fourth council of Toledo (A.D. 633) declared this to be a robbery of the church; it enacted that the next bishop should assert his right over such persons as his predecessor had thus wrongfully liberated, and that any bishop wishing to emancipate a slave should indemnify the church by providing another in his stead.[e] An earlier council—that of Agde, in 506—had restrained the power of bishops to alienate slaves; and, in a spirit curiously opposed to the oriental principles, it forbade monks to manumit their slaves, "lest they should keep holiday while the monks work."[f]

Yet with all this the Church did very much to abate the evils of slavery.[g] It insisted on the natural equality of men, and on the brotherhood of Christians, as motives to kindness towards slaves, and in the treatment of its own dependents it held out an example to lay masters.[h] It threw open its sanctuaries to those who fled from cruelty; it secured their pardon before surrendering them to their owners; it denounced excommunication against any master who should break a promise made to a fugitive slave.[i] It placed the killing of a slave without judicial authority on the same footing of guilt as that of a freeman.[k] It endeavoured to restrain the sale of slaves, by limiting the power which parents among the heathen nations exercised over their own offspring,[m] and by prohibiting that any should be sold to Jews or heathens.[n] It

[b] Vita, c. 14; ap. Mabillon, v. 197.
[c] C. 10.
[d] Planck, ii. 348-350.
[e] Cc. 67-8.
[f] C. 56.
[g] Churton, 149-152; Kemble, i. 208-9; Rettberg, ii. 735.
[h] Lingard, Hist. Eng. i. 418; Rettberg, ii. 736.
[i] See Neander, v. 138, who quotes a horrible story from Gregory of Tours.
[k] Planck, ii. 350.
[m] Theodore of Canterbury (Pœnit. 28) and Egbert of York (Pœnit. i. 27, Thorpe, 354) recognise the right of a father, in cases of need, to sell his son under the age of seven, but not above that age, except with the son's consent. Egbert elsewhere excommunicates those who sell their children (Pœnit. iv. 26, p. 381),—a seeming inconsistency, which is explained by supposing the excommunication to apply to the case of boys over seven years of age. Kemble, i. 199-200.
[n] E. g. Gregor. Epp. i. 10; ix. 36, and elsewhere; Conc. Cabil. A.D. 650, c. 9; Conc. Tolet. x. A.D. 656, c. 7; Laws of Ina, A.D. 696, c. 11 (Thorpe, 48); Capit. Mantuan. c. 7 (Pertz, i. 41). Constantius had forbidden the sale of even a heathen slave to a Jew, lest his conver-

declared the enfranchisement of slaves to be a work conducive to salvation, and it was through the influence of the Church that innumerable masters directed by their wills that their slaves should be set free "for the deliverance of their own souls."[o] The liberation was often, as under the Roman law, visibly associated with religion by being performed in church; the master at the altar resigned his slave to the church, with which the freedman was thenceforth connected by a peculiar tie—he and his descendants paying some slight acknowledgment to it, while, in the failure of posterity, the church was heir to his property.[p]

There was also another way by which the church signally contributed to raise the estimation of the servile classes. As the freemen of the conquering nations were prevented from becoming clergy or monks without the sovereign's leave, in order that he might not lose their military service,[q] the bishops were obliged to recruit the ranks of their clergy chiefly from the classes which were below the obligation to such service.[r] The fourth council of Toledo requires that serfs ordained to be clergy should be emancipated;[s] but it was not until the year 816, in the reign of Louis the Pious, that a similar law was established in France,[t] although before that time the clergy of servile race had been exempted from servile duties.[u] The serf, when ordained, became capable of rising to honour and power; when promoted beyond the minor orders, he was assessed at a *wehr* corresponding to that of high secular rank; and this rose with each step to which he was advanced in the hierarchy.[x] The clergy who had thus been raised from a servile condition to dignity and influence felt themselves bound (apart from all religious motives) to labour for the benefit of the class to which they had originally belonged, and a general elevation of that class was the result.[y]

sion should be hindered. (Biot, De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage en Occident, 185. Paris, 1840.) Gregory III. charges Boniface to prevent Christians from selling slaves to pagans *for sacrifice* (Bonif. Ep. 25). There is a remarkable letter of Adrian I. to Charlemagne in Bouquet, v. 557. Charlemagne had been told that the Romans had sold slaves to the Saracens, apparently with the pope's sanction. Adrian, with much indignant language, endeavours to clear himself of the imputation, and throws the blame on Greeks and Lombards, whom, he says, he had attempted to check, but in vain, as he had not ships to enforce his wishes.

[o] Planck, ii. 360-1; Turner, iii. 480; Kemble, ii. 212.

[p] Conc. Tolet. IV. A.D. 633, cc. 70-1; Planck, ii. 360; Kemble, i. 224; Rettberg, ii. 735. See in Chron. Casin. i. 10 (Pertz, vii.), the donation made by a citizen of Benevento, A.D. 771, to the monastery of Monte Cassino.

[q] See vol. i. p. 504; vol. ii. p. 205.

[r] Planck, ii. 352; Neander, v. 155.

[s] A.D. 633. Can. 74.

[t] Planck, ii. 356. The form then used is in Bouquet, vi. 447.

[u] Planck, ii. 354-6.

[x] See p. 195.

[y] Planck, ii. 356-8; Guizot, ii. 92.

The advancement of persons servilely born to high ecclesiastical station was not, however, unattended by a mixture of bad effects. Thegan, the biographer of Louis the Pious, gives a very unfavourable representation of such clergy. He tells us that, when they have attained to offices of dignity, the gentleness of their former manners is exchanged for insolence, quarrelsomeness, domineering, and assumption; that they emancipate their relations, and either provide for them by church-preferment or marry them into noble families; and that these upstarts are insufferably insolent to the old nobility.[z] The picture is no doubt coloured both by Thegan's prejudices as a man of high birth, and by his indignation at the behaviour of some ecclesiastics towards his unfortunate sovereign; but the parallels both of history and of our own experience may assure us of its substantial truth.

[z] Vit. Hludov. 20. (Pertz. c. ii.)

BOOK II.

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THE COUNCIL OF SUTRI, A.D. 814–1046.

CHAPTER I.

LOUIS THE PIOUS (A.D. 814–840) — END OF THE CONTROVERSY AS TO IMAGES (A.D. 813–842) — THE FALSE DECRETALS.

I. THE great defect of Charlemagne's system was, that it required a succession of such men as himself to carry it on. His actual successors were sadly unequal to sustain the mighty burden of the empire.

Feeling the approach of his end, Charlemagne, after obtaining the concurrence of the national diet, summoned his only surviving legitimate son, Louis, to Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 813. where, in the presence of a vast assemblage, he declared him his colleague and successor in the empire.[a] He exhorted the prince as to the duties of sovereignty, and received from him a promise of obedience to his precepts. He then desired Louis to advance to the high altar, on which an imperial crown was placed, to take the crown, and with his own hands to place it on his head[b]—an act by which the emperor intended to assert that he and his posterity derived their title neither from coronation by the pope nor from the acclamations of the Romans, but immediately from God.[c] Louis returned to the government of Aquitaine, but was soon again summoned to Aix-la-Chapelle, in consequence of his father's death, which took place in January 814.[d]

[a] The chief authorities for the reign of Louis are the lives by Thegan, a suffragan of Treves, and by an unknown writer, who, from his mention of conversations which he held with the Emperor on astronomical subjects (c. 58), is styled the *Astronomer*. Both are in Pertz, ii., and in Bouquet, vi. The name *Ludwig* or *Louis* is the same with *Chlodowig*, the harsh aspirate having been first softened and then omitted. In like manner *Chlotachar* became *Lothair*. Sismondi, ii. 442.

[b] Einhard, Vit. Kar. 30; Thegan, 6; Astron. 20; Funck's Ludwig der Fromme, Frankf. a. M. 1832, 41-5.

[c] See Fleury, xlvi. 7; Gibbon, iv. 507; Luden, v. 227.

[d] Thegan, 8. Charlemagne was *beatified* by the antipope Paschal III., in

Louis, at the time of his accession to the empire, was thirty-six years of age. In his infancy, he had been crowned by Pope Adrian as king of his native province, Aquitaine.[e] He had for many years governed that country, and had earned a high character for the justice and the ability of his administration. He was brave, learned, and accomplished; kindhearted, gentle, and deeply religious.[f] But when from a subordinate royalty he was raised to the head of the Empire, defects before unobserved began to appear in his character. His piety was largely tinctured with superstition; he had already thought it his duty to abjure the study of classic literature for such as was purely religious,[g] and, but for his father's prohibition, he would have become a monk like his great-uncle Carloman.[h] He was without resolution or energy, wanting in knowledge of men, and ready to become the victim of intrigues.[i]

In Aquitaine Louis had been surrounded by a court of his own, and his old advisers retained their influence over him after he had become emperor.[k] Of these the most eminent was Benedict of Aniane, whose rigid virtue could not fail to be scandalised by the licentiousness which, after Charlemagne's example, had increased in the imperial household during the last years of the late reign. This Louis at once proceeded to reform by banishing from the court his sisters and their paramours, with other persons of notoriously light reputation.[m] Nor were the political advisers of Charlemagne spared. Among these the most influential were three brothers, related to the royal family—Adelhard, Wala, and Bernard.[n] Adelhard had in his youth left the court of Charlemagne in disgust at the divorce of the Lombard queen,[o] and had entered the monastery of Corbie, of which he became abbot. In later years, he had acquired a powerful influence over the great emperor; he had been the chief councillor of his son Pipin, in the government of Italy, and, in conjunction with Wala, he had advised

1164, at the instance of the emperor Frederick I. His name is not in the Roman calendar, but the local veneration of him is regarded by canonists as legalised, inasmuch as the sentence of the antipope has not been disallowed by any legitimate pope. (Baron. 814. 63; Butler's Lives of the Saints, Jan. 28.) Some churches, however, as that of Metz, still have a yearly office for the repose of his soul. Fleury, xlvi. 9.

[e] Easter, 781; Astron. 4; Funck, 7.

[f] Astron. 19; Sismondi, ii. 424-6; Palgrave, Norm. and England, 178.

[g] Thegan, 19.

[h] Astron. 19.

[i] Laden, v. 231; Palgrave, N. and E. 187-8; Funck, 39.

[k] Thegan, 20.

[m] Astronom. 21-3.

[n] The lives of Adelhard and Wala ('Epitaphium Arsenii') were written in the form of dialogue by Paschasius Radbert, whose work on the Eucharist will be mentioned in the next chapter. Both are in Mabillon, v.

[o] P. 120; Vit. Adelh. 7-8.

Charlemagne to name Pipin's son Bernard as heir of the empire, in preference to Louis.[p] Adelhard and the youngest brother were banished; Count Wala was compelled to become a monk in the abbey from which Adelhard was removed; and thus was laid the foundation of a lasting enmity between the men of the old and those of the new reign.[q]

Leo III., dissatisfied (as it would seem) at the manner in which Louis had received the crown, omitted to congratulate him on his accession, and did not exact from the Romans the usual oath of fidelity to the emperor.[r] The feuds which had once before endangered this pope's life broke out afresh shortly after the death of his protector. There were serious disorders and much bloodshed at Rome; and Leo took it on himself to punish some of his enemies with death—an act which Louis regarded as an invasion of his own rights as sovereign. He therefore sent his nephew Bernard, king of Italy, to inquire into the matter on the spot; but the pope disarmed his indignation by submitting to give an explanation of his conduct.[s] Leo died in 816.[t] The wealth which he had at his disposal appears to have been enormous, and the papal librarian Anastasius fills many pages with the enumeration of the splendid gifts which it enabled him to bestow on his church. A.D. 815.

The Romans hastily chose as his successor Stephen IV., who was consecrated without any application for the emperor's consent.[u] Stephen felt the necessity of apologising for this irregularity, which he ascribed to the emergency of the time, when popular tumults were to be apprehended. He made the citizens of Rome swear allegiance to Louis, and himself went into France for the purpose of explanation and excuse, and perhaps, also, to secure himself from the violence of the Roman factions.[x] But the devout Louis did not wait for his submission. He met him at the distance of a mile from Rheims; each dismounted from his horse, and the emperor thrice prostrated himself at Stephen's feet before venturing to embrace him.[y] On the following Sunday, the pontiff placed on the head of Louis a splendid crown which he had brought with him, and anointed both him and his empress Ermengarde.[z] Anastasius tells us that the June, 816. Oct. 816.

[p] Vit. Adelh. c. 16; Vit. Walæ, pp. 453, seqq.; Funck, 42.
[q] Vit. Adelh. 32-5; Vit. Wal. 2, 11; Funck, 48.
[r] Funck, 55.
[s] Einhard, Ann. 815; Astron. 25; Baron. 815. 1; Funck, 55.
[t] Pagi, xiii. 568.
[u] Einhard, Ann. 816.
[x] Thegan, 16; Milman, ii. 314.
[y] Thegan, 16; Astron. 26.
[z] Thegan, 17. Luden observes that

honour paid to the pope almost exceeded the power of language to describe; that he obtained from the emperor whatever he desired; that, after our Lord's example of forgiveness, he pardoned all who in the time of Leo had been obliged to seek a refuge in France on account of offences against the Church, and that they accompanied him on his return to Rome.[a] Stephen died in the beginning of the following year (817), and Paschal was immediately chosen and consecrated as his successor. The new pope sent a legation to assure the emperor that he "had been forced rather than had leapt into" his see, and his apology was accepted.[b]

Louis was bent on effecting a reform both in the church and in the state. By means of his *missi* he redressed many grievances which had grown up under his father's government;[c] and in councils held at Aix in 816 and 817, he passed a great number of regulations for the reform of the clergy, and of the religious societies.[d] The secular business in which bishops had been much employed by Charlemagne had not been without an effect on their character and on that of the inferior clergy, so that the state of the church towards the end of the late reign had retrograded.[e] The canons now passed testify to the existence of many abuses; their general tone is strict; they aim at securing influence and respect for the clergy by cutting off their worldly pomp, and enforcing attention to their spiritual duties. The canonical life is regulated by a code enlarged from that of Chrodegang.[f] The acquisition of wealth by improper means is checked by an order that no bequest shall be accepted by churches or monasteries to the disinheriting of the testator's kindred, and that no one shall be tonsured either as a monk or as a clergyman for the sake of obtaining his property.[g] We find, however, complaints of the evils against which this was directed as well after it as before.[h] Another important canon enacted that every parish priest should have a *mansus*, or glebe; that both the glebe and his other property should be discharged from all but ecclesiastical service;[i] and that, when this provision should have been fulfilled, every

the biographer does not, until after this coronation, give Louis the title of emperor. v. 579.

[a] Anastas. 213; Astron. 26.

[b] Astron. 27; Schröckh, xxii. 40.

[c] Thegan, 13; Sismondi, ii. 432. The scheme of administration by missi had been very imperfectly carried out under Charlemagne. Stephen, i. 112.

[d] See Pertz, Leges, i. 201, seqq.; or Hard. iv.

[e] Ellendorf, ii. 51-2.

[f] See p. 200.

[g] Capit. 817, c. 7. (Pertz, i. 207.)

[h] Ellendorf, ii. 58-62, gives quotations from Paschasius, Wettin, &c. The evil had been noted by the council of Châlons in 813, c. 6-7.

[i] C. 10 (Pertz, i. 207). The Astronomer says that a male and a female serf were also attached to each living. 28.

parish, where there was a sufficient maintenance, should have a priest of its own.[k] Benedict of Aniane was president of the assembly which was charged with the monastic reform. He recovered to their proper use many monasteries which had been alienated either to laymen or to secular clergy; and he obtained relief for many from the burdens of gifts to the crown and of military service, which had pressed so heavily on some of them, that the remaining income had been insufficient even for food and clothing.[m] The rule of St. Benedict was taken as the basis of the new reforms; but the canons are marked by a punctilious minuteness very unlike its original spirit.[n]

These reforms were the work of the independent Frankish church, and were sanctioned by the supreme authority of the emperor, who exercised the same prerogative as his father in matters concerning religion.[o]

In the holy week of 817, as Louis and his household were passing along a gallery which led from the palace to the cathedral of Aix, the wooden pillars on which it rested gave way. The emperor suffered little hurt; but the accident suggested to his counsellors the possibility of his death, and the expediency of providing for that event.[p] By their advice he proposed the subject to the national assembly, and obtained its consent to the association of his eldest son, Lothair, as his colleague in the empire.[q] This measure, which was intended for the preservation of peace, became the source of fatal divisions. The younger brothers, Pipin and Louis, who held respectively a delegated sovereignty over Aquitaine and Germany,[r] were discontented at finding themselves placed in a new relation of inferiority towards their *senior*,[s] to whom they were bound to pay gifts (*munera*), and without whose consent they were not at liberty to make war or peace, to receive ambassadors, or to marry.[t] But the elevation of Lothair was still more offensive to Bernard, son of the emperor's elder brother Pipin by a concubine. Bernard had been appointed by Charlemagne to succeed his father in the kingdom of Italy. The defect of his birth

[k] C. 11.

[m] Vit. S. Ben. Anian. (Mabillon, V.), c. 50, 54; Astron. 28.

[n] Guizot, ii. 317.

[o] Guizot, ii. 318; Milman, ii. 315-7. Baronius, however, ventures to assert the contrary. 819. 11.

[p] Astron. 28.

[q] Funck, 62-3. It was not by primogeniture but by election that Lothair became emperor. Martin, ii. 507.

[r] Pagi, xiii. 539.

[s] It was in the ninth century that this word, from meaning the eldest or head of a family, came to bear the sense of *lord* or *master*, which its derivatives have in the Romance languages. Hincmar seems to object to it as novel and improper, ii. 835.

[t] Divisio Imperii, cc. 7, 8, 13. (Pertz, Leges, i. 199.)

was not regarded by the Franks as a bar to inheritance; as it had not prevented his receiving a subordinate royalty, it did not disqualify him for succeeding his grandfather in the empire.[u] It was chiefly on the ground of maturer age that Louis, the younger son of Charlemagne, had been preferred to the representative of the elder son, and Bernard might have now expected on the same ground to be preferred to the children of Louis.[x] The king of Italy had hitherto endeavoured, by a ready submission and compliance with his uncle's wishes in all things, to disarm the jealousy which the empress Ermengarde continually strove to instil into the mind of Louis.[y] But he now yielded to the influence of the discontented party, of which Theodulf of Orleans, a Goth or Lombard by birth, and the bishops of Milan and Cremona were the most active members, while Wala from his monastery zealously aided them by his counsels. The pope himself, Paschal, is said to have been implicated in their schemes.[z] But the emperor and his partisans made demonstrations, which showed that any attempt to subvert the government would be hopeless. Bernard repaired to Châlons—decoyed, according to some writers,[a] by the empress, under a promise of forgiveness and safety. He confessed to his uncle his guilty designs, and, after a trial, was sentenced to death. Louis compassionately changed this sentence to the loss of his eyes; but, whether from the cruelty with which the operation was performed, or from grief and despair, the unhappy Bernard died within three days.[b] Theodulf was deprived of his see, without any regard to his claim that, as having received the pall, he was subject to no jurisdiction except the pope's.[c] Louis, now rendered suspicious of all his kindred, compelled three of his illegitimate brothers—of whom Drogo was afterwards creditably known as bishop of Metz—to be tonsured.[d]

[u] See Funck, 42, 240, 243.

[x] Michelet, ii. 93; Luden, v. 262-3.

[y] Sismondi, ii. 436.

[z] Ellendorf, ii. 90.

[a] Sismondi, ii. 443-6; Funck, 65. Dean Milman (ii. 319) questions this, which he supposes to have no authority but that of Funck; but it is also said by Muratori, and by an ancient writer whom he quotes. (Luden, v. 584.) Luden himself thinks it uncertain, but not unlikely. 265-6.

[b] Both reasons are given. Ermengarde is said to have instigated the cruelty. See Thegan, 22-3; Sismondi, ii. 443-5; Funck, 66; Palgrave, i. 231. The Astronomer seems to mean that Bernard and another committed suicide—"Dum impatientius oculorum ablationem tulerunt, mortis sibi conciverunt acerbitatem." c. 30. See the various accounts in Luden, v. 268 and note.

[c] Funck, 68.

[d] Thegan, 24; Sismondi, ii. 445-6. To this time belongs the pretended date of a document known from its first words as *Ego Ludovicus* (Pertz, Leges, ii., Append. 6), in which the emperor is represented as giving up a large part of Italy to the pope, and as ordering that no Frank, Lombard, or other person shall interfere in the appointment of popes. Sir F. Palgrave seems to regard

The empress Ermengarde, whose zeal for the interest of her sons had been a principal cause of the late troubles, died shortly after. Louis in his sorrow was disposed to resign his crown and become a monk. But the ecclesiastics whom he consulted dissuaded him; the daughters of his nobles were assembled for his inspection, and he chose Judith, daughter of Welf, count of Bavaria, to be the partner of his throne.[e] The new empress is described as not only beautiful, but possessed of learning and accomplishments unusual in the ladies of that age, and her influence over her husband was absolute.[f] A.D. 819.

In 821, on the marriage of Lothair, Theodulf, Wala, Adelhard, and the other accomplices of Bernard were forgiven[g]—an act of grace which has been traced to the removal of Benedict by death from the emperor's councils.[h] But Louis was still disturbed by the remembrance of the severities which had been exercised in his name; the alarms of his conscience were increased by some reverses, by earthquakes, and other portents;[i] and at the diet of Attigny, in the following year, he appeared in the dress of a penitent. He lamented his own sins and the sins of his father. He expressed remorse for the death of Bernard—an act in which his only share had been that mitigation of the sentence which had been so unhappily frustrated in the execution. He entreated the forgiveness of Wala and Adelhard, who were present. He professed sorrow for his behaviour to Drogo and his brothers, and bestowed high ecclesiastical dignities on them by way of compensation. He gave large alms to monks, and entreated their prayers; and he issued a capitulary acknowledging his neglect of duty towards the Church, and promising amendment of abuses.[k] Wala was sent into Italy, to act as adviser to Lothair, who had obtained that kingdom on the death of Bernard.[m] A.D. 822.

On Easter-day, 823, Lothair, who had gone to Rome on the invitation of Paschal,[n] was there crowned by the pope as emperor. He had already been crowned by his father, at the time of his

it as genuine. (Norm. and England, i. 262, 727.) But it is generally considered a clumsy forgery. (See Pagi, xiii. 591; Schröckh, xxii. 44; Planck, ii. 779; Pertz, p. 9.) Pagi's candour in this matter is distressing to a later annotator on Baronius (xiii. 625), and to the Abbé Rohrbacher, xi. 404.

[e] Astron. 32; Thegan, 26; Einhard, Ann. 819.

[f] Michelet, ii. 96-7.

[g] Vit. Adelh. 46; Astron. 34; Einh. Ann. 821; Pagi, xiv. 20-3. Theodulf died the same year. Pagi, 23.

[h] Funck, 71, 241; Gfrörer, iii. 727.

[i] Luden, v. 278.

[k] Capit. Attiniac. (Pertz, i. 231); Astron. 35; Vit. Adelh. 51; Sismondi, ii. 453-5; Palgrave, i. 249.

[m] Vit. Walæ, 25.

[n] Astron. 36; Einhard, Ann. 823. Paschasius untruly says that Louis *sent* his son to be crowned at Rome. Vit. Walæ. See Ellendorf, ii. 26.

elevation to a share in the empire; but Paschal, by persuading him to accept this second coronation, as an ecclesiastical sanction of his authority, carried on a chain of policy which resulted in persuading the world that sovereignty was derived from the successors of St. Peter.

Soon after Lothair's departure from the city, two high officers of the Church, who were among the chief of the emperor's Roman partisans, were decoyed into the Lateran place, where—in punishment, as was believed, of their attachment to the Frank interest—they were blinded and afterwards beheaded.[o] Louis, on hearing of this affair, sent a count and an abbot to investigate it. The pope appeared before the commissioners, and, with thirty-four bishops and five other clergymen, swore that he had no share in the death of the victims. But he maintained that they had deserved it as traitors; and he refused to give up the murderers, on the ground that they had sought the protection of St. Peter, and belonged to the Apostle's family. The commissioners, having no authority to use force, reported the circumstances to their master, and Paschal at the same time sent some envoys to offer explanations. The emperor did not pursue the matter further; but he resolved to place his relations with Rome on a more satisfactory footing.[p]

An opportunity was soon furnished in consequence of Paschal's death, which took place in May, 824.[q] A severe contest arose for the papacy. Lothair went to Rome, and asserted the Frankish sovereignty by acknowledging Eugenius II., the candidate who was supported by Wala's influence,[r] as the rightful successor of St. Peter.[s] The young emperor complained of the late murder of his adherents. He inquired why the popes and the Roman judges were continually spoken against. He discovered that many pieces of land had been wrongfully seized by the popes (perhaps under the pretence that they were legacies to the Church), and caused great joy by restoring them to the rightful owners. He settled that, "according to ancient custom," imperial commissioners should visit Rome at certain times, for the general administration of

[o] Astron. 37; Einh. Ann. 823. See Luden, v. 293.

[p] Einh. Ann. 823; Astron. 37-8; Funck, 76-7; Sismondi, ii. 458-9.

[q] Paschal was so detested by the Romans that they would not allow him to be buried with his predecessors; but Eugenius ordered the body to be interred in a place which Paschal had prepared. (Thegan, 30.) Funck supposes that by *populus* Thegan here means the *nobility* of Rome. 78, 251.

[r] Vit. Walæ, 28. He was the candidate of the party opposed to Louis. Luden, v. 295.

[s] Baron. 824. 12. Pagi (xiii. 60, 93) points out that Lothair acted as sovereign, not as protector of the church.

justice.[t] He exacted of the Romans individually an oath of fealty to the empire, saving their faith to the pope. He enacted that no person should interfere with their right of electing a bishop; but he bound them by an engagement that they would not allow any one to be consecrated as pope, until he should have sworn allegiance to the emperor in the presence of an imperial commissioner.[u] This engagement was sometimes neglected or evaded; but the report of Lothair's proceedings is evidence of the ideas which were then entertained as to the relations of the papacy and the empire. The emperor was entitled to investigate elections to the Roman see, and to decide between the pretensions of candidates; and, while the pope was the immediate lord of Rome, his power was held under the emperor, to whom the supreme control of the administration belonged.[x]

After four years of childless marriage, Judith in 823 gave birth to a son, Charles, afterwards known as *the Bald*. The jealousy of the emperor's sons by Ermengarde was excited; they declared Charles to be the offspring of adultery, and charged Judith with bewitching their father.[y] The empress, on her part, was bent on securing for her son an inheritance like that of his elder brothers, and in 829 he was created duke of Germany—probably in the vain hope that such a title would give less offence than that of king.[z] Louis, under the influence of his wife, laboured to buy partisans for Charles by profuse gifts from the hereditary domains of his family and from the property of the church.[a] On this account he had been bitterly attacked by Wala, at a diet held in 828;[b] and when his elder sons now broke out into rebellion, they were aided by a powerful party of the hierarchy, headed by Wala (who had succeeded Adelhard in the abbacy of Corbie in 826),[c] the archchaplain Hilduin, abbot of St. Denys, Jesse bishop of Amiens, and an abbot named Elissachar.[d] Of the motives of these ecclesiastics it is difficult to judge. They may have honestly felt the dangers which threatened the empire from the system of partition which had been introduced;[e] they may have been galled by the imperial control of ecclesiastical affairs, as well as by the invasions of church property. But the pretensions to superiority over the crown which began now to be asserted in their councils

[t] Einh. Ann. 824; Astron. 38.
[u] Pertz, Leges, i. 240; Milman, ii. 323-4.
[x] Luden, v. 298; Funck, 81.
[y] Sismondi, ii. 467.
[z] Funck, 101.
[a] Funck, 98-9.
[b] Vit. Wal. ii. 2-3.
[c] Pagi, xiv. 118.
[d] Thegan, 36; Ellendorf, ii. 105.
[e] Vit. Wal. ii. 10.

are startling,[f] and the conduct by which they followed up their theories was utterly indefensible.

Judith was caught by the insurgents at Laon, and was pursued by the curses of the people into a convent at Poitiers, where she was compelled to take the veil.[g] She was also forced to engage that she would use her influence over her husband to pursuade him to enter a monastery. But the inclination which Louis had formerly felt towards the monastic life was now mastered by his love for Judith and Charles. He asked time for consideration;[h] and, in spite of all opposition, he contrived that the next national assembly should not be held in Gaul, where the population were generally disaffected to the Frankish rulers, but at Nimeguen, where he might hope to be supported by the kindred and friendly Germans.[i] The event answered his expectation. Louis found himself restored to power. Hilduin, who had ventured to transgress an order that the members of the diet and their followers should appear unarmed, was banished; and a like sentence was passed on Wala, with others of his party.[k] Lothair (who had rebelled after having sworn to maintain Charles in his dukedom), with characteristic meanness made his submission, gave up his accomplices, and joined in giving judgment against them.[m] Judith was brought forth from her convent, the pope having declared that her forced profession was null.[n] She undertook to prove by ordeal her innocence of the witchcraft and adultery imputed to her; but, as no accuser appeared, she was allowed to purge herself by oath; and Bernard, count of Septimania, her supposed paramour, on offering to clear himself by the wager of battle, found no one to accept his challenge.[o] Some of those who had been most hostile to Louis in his distress were condemned to death; but with his usual gentleness, he allowed them to escape with slighter punishments.[p]

A.D. 830.

Again and again Judith's eagerness for the interest of her own son, and the jealousy of the elder brothers, brought trouble on the unhappy Louis, who seems to have fallen into a premature decay. A fresh insurrection took place in 832, in consequence of Charles'

[f] In 829, councils were held at Paris, Mentz, Lyons, and Toulouse (Hard. iv. 1279), and their decrees were consolidated in a fifth meeting at Worms (Pertz, Leges, i. 332, seqq.); their views as to the right of controlling the sovereign may be seen in book ii. of the Parisian Council, or in Pertz, 346.

[g] Sismondi, iii. 6-7.

[h] Astron. 44; Funck, 109.

[i] Sismondi, iii. 9-10; Stephen, ii. 117.

[k] Funck, 113.

[m] Astron. 45.

[n] Thegan, 37.

[o] Thegan, 38; Sismondi, ii. 14-6.

[p] Astron. 46.

advancement to the kingdom of Aquitaine; the pope, Gregory IV., who partly owed his dignity to the influence of Wala and Hilduin, crossed the Alps, and appeared in the camp of the rebels, where Wala and the other ecclesiastical chiefs of the party waited on him. Louis was supported by many bishops, who, on a report that the pope meant to excommunicate them and the emperor, declared that if he had come with such intentions, he himself should be deposed and excommunicated.[q] An answer which he issued, and which was probably written by Paschasius,[r] had no effect; and he began to show uneasiness and discontent with the part which he had undertaken, when Wala and Paschasius reassured him by producing a collection of canons and decretals which showed that the pope had the right to judge all causes and could himself be judged by no man.[s] It seems to have been at this time[t] that Agobard, of Lyons, sent forth two tracts—the one, a comparison between hierarchical and secular authority; the other, a defence of the rebel princes. In the first of these, he insists on the superiority of the ecclesiastical power; he utters many reproaches against the emperor, and exhorts him to submit to the pope. If, indeed, Gregory had come without reason, and for the purpose of fighting, he would deserve to be driven back;[u] but if he came for peace, he ought to be obeyed. In the other pamphlet, Agobard charges Judith with gross and notorious profligacy; he justifies the proceedings of the emperor's sons; and, as a precedent for the part taken by himself and his brethren, he alleges the opposition which the priests and prophets of Israel offered to Jezebel and Athaliah.[x] He tells the emperor that Samson, for his love to an unchaste and unbelieving woman, lost his eyes and his judgeship; he exhorts him, since he has thus far been like Samson in the loss of his power, to study that, like him, he may escape the forfeit of his eternal portion by humbly and penitently submitting to his lot.[y]

A.D. 833.

[q] Astron. 48; Vit. Walæ, ii. 16; Greg. Ep. ad Episcopos, Bouquet, vi. 353. The genuineness of this letter has been questioned. Bouquet (252) considers that it is established by De Marca (I. iv. c. 11). Luden is against it. v. 608.

[r] This letter also is questioned. See Jaffé, 227, who dates it July 8, after the "Field of Lies."

[s] Vit. Walæ, ii. 16. Luden (v. 610) and Gfrörer (Karolinger, i. 81) argue that these must have been something unknown at Rome—the elements of the forged decretals, which soon after appeared.

[t] Funck, 132; Ellendorf, ii. 115.

[u] "Certe si nunc Gregorius papa irrationabiliter et ad pugnandum venit, merito et pugnatus et repulsus recedet." De Compar. utriusque reginiinis, 6. (Agob. Opera, t. ii.)

[x] Lib. Apolog. pro filiis Ludovici, 11.

[y] Cc. 12-3.

On St. John Baptist's day, the two armies encamped opposite to each other near Colmar.[z] Gregory paid a visit to the emperor, who received him without the usual marks of respect;[a] but they afterwards exchanged presents, and the pope continued to pass from the one camp to the other. Arguments, threats, money, and other inducements were employed to influence the adherents of Louis; and, on the morning of St. Peter and St. Paul's day (June 29), he found that all but a handful of men had deserted him during the night. On discovering his forlorn condition, he professed himself unwilling to be the cause of bloodshed; he advised those of his followers who could expect no mercy from the rebels to save themselves by flight, desired the others to follow the example of the majority, and gave himself up as a prisoner to his sons.[b] The pope is said to have returned to Italy in deep grief and shame on account of his share in these transactions.[c] The popular feeling was shown by the name given to the scene where they took place—*Lügenfeld*, "the field of lies."[d]

June 24, 833.

Judith, for whose safety in life and limb the successful rebels had pledged themselves by oath, was sent across the Alps to Tortona.[e] Charles was shut up in the abbey of Prüm, and Louis was led about as a captive by his eldest son. But Lothair and his advisers soon became aware that a general feeling of pity was rising in favour of the unfortunate emperor,[f] and they resolved to defeat it by an act which was intended to disqualify him for reigning. At a diet held at Compiègne, a bishop (probably Agobard)[g] begged Lothair's permission that a representation should be made to Louis of the misdeeds by which he had lowered the empire of the great Charles. There was little show of opposition to the proposal;[h] Louis in his captivity was importuned by a number of bishops, among whom Thegan tells us that the most active were some of servile or barbaric birth, and above all "shameless and most cruel," the emperor's fosterbrother, Ebbo, of Rheims, who had turned against him at the Field of Lies.[i] In an indictment of eight heads, drawn up with much iteration, and partly made up of offences for which he had already done penance

[z] Astron. 48.
[a] Ibid.; Vit. Walæ, ii. 17.
[b] Thegan, 42; Astron. 48; Funck, 132-3.
[c] Astron. 48.
[d] Palgrave, Norm. and Eng. c. 290-1.
[e] Thegan, 42.
[f] Astron. 49.
[g] Funck, 156.
[h] Astron. 49.
[i] Thegan, 43. See Luden; v. 363-4.

at Attigny, he was charged with acts of violence towards his relations—the death of Bernard, the tonsuring of Drogo and his brothers; with frequent breach of oaths, especially as to the partition of the empire; with having violated the rest of holy seasons by military expeditions and by holding courts or diets; with outrages and injustice against many of his subjects; with having caused waste of life and an infinite amount of misery, through the calamities of war.[k] The bishops assumed the right of judging the emperor. They condemned him in his absence, declared him to be deprived of earthly power, and, in order to prevent the loss of his soul, they sentenced him to do penance before the relics of St. Medard and St. Sabinian at Soissons.[m] He was strictly guarded in a cell, until the day appointed for the ceremony, when he was led forth, not as a sovereign, but as a sinful Christian desirous of showing penitence for his offences. Lothair was present, with a large body of bishops and clergy, and the cathedral was filled by a crowd of spectators.[n] The emperor, clothed in sackcloth, prostrated himself before the altar; he acknowledged that he had been guilty of misgovernment, offensive to God, scandalous to the church, and disastrous to his subjects; and he professed a wish to do penance, that he might obtain absolution for his misdeeds. The bishops told him that a sincere confession would be followed by forgiveness, and exhorted him that he should not, as on the former occasion, attempt to hide any part of his sin. The list of charges against him was put into his hands; with a profusion of tears he owned himself guilty of all; and he gave up the document, to be placed on the altar as a record of his repentance. He then laid down his sword and his military belt; he was stripped of the secular dress, which he had worn under his sackcloth; and after these acts it was pretended that, according to the ancient canons, he was incapable of returning to the exercise of arms or of sovereign power.[o] Every bishop who had been concerned in the affair drew up a memoir of it, which he gave into the hands of Lothair.[p] October.

But the projectors of this humiliation were mistaken in their hopes. Compassion for the emperor and indignation against those who had outraged him under the pretence of religion, were almost universal. His younger sons, Pipin and Louis, took his part, and Lothair, alarmed by the tokens of the general feeling, hastily with-

[k] Acta Exauctorationis, Bouquet, v. 243-6, or Pertz, Leges, i. 366.
[m] Bouquet, 244; Astron. 49.
[n] Acta, ap. Bouquet, 244.
[o] Sismondi, iii. 30.
[p] Acta, ap. Bouquet, vi. 246. Agobard's paper is given there, and in his works, ii. 73.

drew from St. Denys, leaving his father at liberty. Friends speedily gathered around Louis; he was advised to resume his military ornaments, but refused to do so unless with the formal sanction of the church. He was therefore solemnly reconciled in the abbey of St. Denys; his belt and sword were restored to him by some of the same bishops who had been concerned in his degradation; it was declared that a penitent who had laid down his belt might resume it on the expiration of his penance; and the general joy at the emperor's restoration drew encouragement from a sudden change of the weather, which had long been boisterous and ungenial.[q] In February, 835, a council was held at Thionville, where eight archbishops and thirty-three bishops condemned their brethren who had shared in the proceedings at Compiègne and Soissons. Among these delinquents the most noted was Ebbo, a man of servile birth, who had been fosterbrother of Louis, and like other low-born clerks, had been promoted by him with a view of counterbalancing the aristocratic prelates who aimed at independence of the crown.[r] Ebbo was a man of learning, and had laboured as a missionary among the northern tribes;[s] but his behaviour towards his benefactor had been conspicuously ungrateful.[t] He had been rewarded by Lothair with a rich abbey, and, when the cause of Louis again became triumphant, he had fled, with all the wealth that he could collect, in the hope of finding a refuge among the Northmen.[u] At Thionville, he ascended the pulpit of the church, where he acknowledged that all the late proceedings against the emperor were unjust and sinful. He then wrote and subscribed a profession of his own unworthiness; he was deposed from his see, and was sent for custody to the abbey of Fulda. Other bishops were gently treated, on confessing their guilt. Agobard, who did not appear, was condemned for his contumacy.[x]

Lothair was deprived of the imperial title, and was confined to the kingdom of Italy.[y] But Judith afterwards found it expedient

[q] Thegan, 45-8; Astron. 51; Annal. Bertin. 834; Sismondi, iii. 31-3; Funck, 143-150.

[r] Milman, ii. 329. Ebbo was promoted instead of Gislemar, a man of noble family, who had been nominated to the see, but was found unable to read. Hist. Litt. v. 100.

[s] See below, chap. iv.

[t] He is the especial object of Thegan's abhorrence. See above, p. 232. In relating the penance at Soissons, the biographer apostrophises Ebbo, and reproaches him with clothing in sackcloth the prince who had clothed *him* in purple, &c. c. 44.

[u] Flodoard, ap. Bouquet, vi. 213-4.

[x] Annal. Bertin. 835; Flodoard, ap. Bouquet, vi. 215; Hincmar, ibid. 252; Hard. iv. 1385; Thegan, 56; Astron. 54; Funck, 151-2.

[y] Sismondi, iii. 35.

to make overtures to him, and a partition—the last of the partitions which attest the difficulties and the weakness of Louis—was made in 839, by which Pipin, the emperor's grandson, was to be excluded from inheriting his father's kingdom of Aquitaine; and, with the exception of Bavaria, which was left to the younger Louis, the whole empire was to be shared between Lothair and Charles.[z] To the last the unhappy reign of Louis was distracted by the enmities of his sons, who had alike cast away all filial and all brotherly regards. He died on the 20th of June, 840, in an island of the Rhine opposite Ingelheim, when engaged in an expedition against his son Louis of Germany. On his deathbed he received the consolations of religion from his illegitimate brother Drogo, bishop of Metz. His last words, "Out! Out!"[a] were interpreted as an adjuration commanding the evil spirit to depart.[b]

During the earlier years of this reign, the fame of Charlemagne continued to invest the empire with dignity in the eyes of foreign nations, and Louis himself carried on successful war in various directions.[c] But the dissensions of the Franks afterwards exposed them to enemies from without. The Northmen, whose first appearances on the coast had filled the mind of Charlemagne with gloomy forebodings,[d] advanced up the Scheld in 820.[e] In 835, they burnt the great trading city of Dorstadt, with its fifty-four churches;[f] and their ravages were felt on the banks of the Loire and elsewhere. To the south, the Saracens were a no less formidable foe; in 838 they plundered Marseilles, and carried off its monks and clergy as prisoners.[g] And on the east, the Slavonic nations had taken advantage of the Frankish contests to make inroads on the imperial territory. The dangers which thus threatened the empire on various sides became yet more serious under the successors of Louis.

II. Although the decision of the second Nicene council had been established as law in the eastern empire, the conformity to it which was enforced was in many cases insincere. A considerable party among the bishops and clergy was opposed to the worship of images; and in the army, the enthusiasm with which

[z] Sismondi, iii. 43; Palgrave, i. 306.

[a] *Haz, haz*, equivalent to the modern German *Aus*.

[b] Astron. 63-4; Luden (v. 400) supposes the meaning to be *Es ist aus*, "It is over." Louis the German had, in 874, a vision, in which his father begged him, in Latin, to obtain his release from purgatory. Annal. Fuld. (Pertz i. 387.)

[c] Funck, 66-9.

[d] Monach. Sangallen. ii. 14 (Pertz, i. 757).

[e] Sismondi, ii. 449.

[f] Palgrave, i. 297.

[g] Sismondi, iii. 41-2.

the memory of the martial iconoclastic emperors was cherished was usually accompanied by an attachment to their opinions.[h]

Leo V., "the Armenian," who in 813 became emperor by the deposition of Michael Rhangabe, was, by the influence both of his early training and of his military associations, opposed to the worship of images.[i] His enemies speak of him by the name of *Chameleon*,[k] on account of the insincere and changeable character which they impute to him; but even they allow that he was a man of unusual energy and of abilities which fitted him to sustain the declining empire.[m] The patriarch Nicephorus—not (it would seem) from suspicion, but merely in compliance with custom—required him on his elevation to subscribe a profession of faith; but Leo desired that the matter should be deferred until after his coronation, and, when the application was then renewed, he refused.[n]

Like other adventurers who rose to the possession of empire (and probably like a far greater number in whom the promise was not fulfilled) Leo had in earlier life been told that he was destined to become emperor. Hence he derived an inclination to believe in prophecies; and a monk, who, by a rare exception to the feeling of his class, was adverse to the cause of images, now assured him of a long and glorious reign if he would suppress the worship of them, while he threatened him with calamity in case of his acting otherwise.[o] The words produced their effect on Leo; and he was further influenced by a comparison between the prosperous reigns of the iconoclastic emperors and the misfortunes of those who had followed an opposite policy.[p] He resolved to take the Isaurian Leo and his son for his examples; but before proceeding to action, he wished to assure himself as to the grounds of his cause. He therefore desired Antony, bishop of Sylæum in Pamphylia, John "the Grammarian," and other ecclesiastics, to abridge for his information the acts of Constantine's iconoclastic synod,[q] and to collect authorities from the fathers against the adoration of images.[r] He then opened the matter to Nicephorus—urging that the disasters of the empire were popularly ascribed to the worship of images—an assertion which ought

A.D. 814.

[h] Schlosser, 405; Neander, vi. 263.

[i] Schlosser, 393.

[k] Auctor Incertus (i. e. an anonymous continuator of Theophanes) in vol. ix. of the Byzantine historians, ed. Paris, p. 439.

[m] Cedrenus, 490.

[n] Walch. x. 667; Finlay, ii. 134. Auct. Incert. says that he promised to make no innovations as to religion, 431.

[o] Cedren. 486-9; Hard. iv. 1045; Walch, x. 593; Schlosser, 405-6. The accounts of these prophecies vary greatly. Walch is inclined to reject the whole story, x. 624, 662-4.

[p] Auct. Incert. 415.

[q] See p. 91.

[r] Auct. Incert. 436; Schlosser, 406-7.

perhaps to be taken as representing the feeling of the soldiery alone; and he proposed that such as were placed low[s] and within reach should be removed.[t] The patriarch refused his consent; on which the emperor asked him to produce any scriptural warrant in favour of images.[u] Nicephorus replied that the worship of these, like many other unwritten things, was matter of apostolical tradition, and had been taught to the Church by the Holy Ghost; that it would be as reasonable to ask for scriptural proof in favour of reverencing the Cross or the Gospels. And, on being desired to argue the question with Antony and John, or to refute the authorities which they had produced against his views, he declined, on the ground that he must have nothing to do with heretics.[x]

Nicephorus and his partisans—clergy, monks, and laity—now held nightly meetings in the cathedral, where they engaged in prayer for the frustration of the emperor's designs, and bound themselves to stand by the cause of images even to the death.[y] On hearing of these assemblies, Leo in the dead of night sent for the patriarch, and the question was discussed at great length.[z] Nicephorus repeated his declaration as to the unlawfulness of holding conference with heretics,[a] and, after a time, asked leave to introduce his friends, who had been waiting without the palace. Of these the most prominent was Theodore, a priest, and abbot of a monastery in the capital, founded by Studius, a noble Roman, and better known by a name derived from his than by that of its patron, St. John the Baptist.[b] Theodore was a nephew of the Abbot Plato, who had excommunicated Constantine (the son of Irene) on account of his second marriage,[c] and had vehemently opposed Tarasius for his compliance with the emperor's will. Theodore himself had taken part with his uncle; he had endured exile and other severities in punishment of his contumacy, and had incurred fresh penalties under the reign of Nicephorus, when some A.D. 795-6.

[s] *τα χαμηλὰ*. See Neander, vi. 265.

[t] Gieseler, II. 1. 9-10.

[u] Walch remarks that Leo did not take his stand on the Old Testament prohibitions, as the iconoclasts had been accustomed to evade these; but that he asked for a New Testament *precept*. x. 696.

[x] Anct. Incert. 437; Schlosser, 407.

[y] Anct. Incert. 439; Walch, x. 672-3; Schröckh, xxiii. 359.

[z] Anct. Inc. 438.

[a] See Baron. 814. 9; Neander, v. 268-9.

[b] For Theodore, see Schröckh, xxiii. 105. His remains, with a Life by his disciple Michael, form the vth volume of Sirmond's 'Opera Varia,' Venet. 1728.

[c] Vit. Theod. c. 20. See p. 148. There is a curious letter by Theodore, written towards the end of his life, in which he explains why Constantine might be stigmatised as a *Herod*, on account of his marriage, and yet might be commemorated as an orthodox emperor. Ep. ii. 218.

questions connected with the affair of Constantine's marriage were revived.[d] Under his care, the Studite community had increased the number of its members from about twelve to nearly a thousand, and the strictness of its discipline had acquired for it an eminence above all other Greek monasteries.[e] His character and sufferings had won for him an influence which made him important even in the eyes of the sovereign. Theodore took up the cause of images with all his characteristic zeal. There were, indeed, among its partisans some extravagances so violent that he felt himself obliged to reject and to censure them;[f] but he himself went so far as to eulogise a high official for employing an image as sponsor for a child.[g] He held that images were not for the unlearned only, but were necessary for the most advanced Christian;[h] that a reverence for them was necessary for a right faith in the Incarnation. If images were suppressed, he said, "our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain."[i]

A.D. 808.

On being admitted into the emperor's presence, Theodore entered on the subject of images with great vehemence.[k] He reproached Leo for innovating in matters of religion, and reminded him of the fate which had befallen emperors who had been enemies of the faith. The Old Testament prohibitions of images, he said, are abolished by the Incarnation; if the law of Moses were to be regarded, how is it we worship the cross, which the law speaks of as accursed? and he urged the other usual topics of his party. The emperor told him that his insolence was notorious, but that he would be disappointed if he wished for the glory of martyrdom.[m] Theodore rejoined that the imperial power was limited to external matters; that, according to St. Paul, God had "set in the Church first apostles, then prophets, and afterwards teachers," but that nothing was said of emperors; that the emperor was bound to obey in matters of religion, and not

[d] Vit. 22, 43-5; Ep. i. 21, 28; Cedren. 477-8; Baron. 795-6, 808-9; Walch, x. 659.

[e] Vita, 14, 28, seqq.

[f] Thus, one of his letters (i. 15) is addressed to a stylite who had painted angels crucified, and the Saviour and angels as in old age. He finds it necessary to lay down repeatedly that the worship to be paid to images is not properly *latreutic*, but *relative* (σχετική), and that any other is idolatrous (Epp. ii. 85, 151, 161, 167, 212); and he ends his first dialogue (Antirrheticus, i. p. 83) by declaring, "If any one, carrying to excess the reverence of Christ's image, say that he does not approach it, and would get no benefit from it, unless he were first cleansed from all sin, he is without reason" (ἄλογος—a variation from the preceding denunciations, of which each ends—"he is a heretic").

[g] Ep. i. 17.

[h] Ep. ii. 171.

[i] 1 Cor. xv. 14; Vita, 64.

[k] His speech is in the Life, 65-72.

[m] Vita, 73.

to usurp the office of others.[n] "Do you exclude me from the church?" asked Leo. "It is not I," the monk replied, "but the Apostle; nay rather, it is you who have excluded yourself by your deeds." The emperor desired that Antony of Sylæum might be released from the excommunication which Nicephorus had pronounced against him; but this was refused, and at length Leo in anger dismissed the patriarch and his party. On leaving the palace Theodore was kissed by his companions, and was greeted with demonstrations of the warmest admiration on account of the stand which he had made.[o]

Leo now desired the friends of images to give up their meetings, to remain quietly at home, and to refrain from discussing the subjects which were in question; and he required them to give a written promise of obedience. Some complied; but, before Nicephorus had indicated his intentions, Theodore sent forth a violent circular addressed to all the monks of the empire,[p] censuring the patriarch for his neglect to take more decided measures against the emperor, and threatening with eternal punishment all who should desert the cause of images. He kept up a lively agitation by means of letters, visits, and conversations.[q] He composed three tracts[r] on the subject—the first two in the form of dialogue between an orthodox man and a heretic; the third, consisting of the iconoclastic objections with answers to them. He also defended images in poems and other pieces.

The emperor's opinions as to images were not of any extreme kind. He did not wish to destroy them, or even to remove such as might be retained without superstition; nor did he desire to disturb the convictions of those who were attached to them, if they would consent to extend a like toleration to others.[s] But the vehemence of Theodore and his party, who regarded the worship of images as following on a right faith in the Incarnation, provoked Leo to measures of great severity. The soldiery, without waiting for a legal warrant (yet perhaps incited by the emperor, as his enemies asserted), broke out into tumult, and rushed to the brazen gate, where the image of "the Surety," so famous in an earlier stage of the controversy,[t] had been reinstated by Irene. They uttered much abusive language, and pelted the figure with dirt and stones; whereupon the

Dec. 814.

[n] Vita, 74.
[o] Vita, 75.
[p] Ep. ii. 2.
[q] Vita, 76; Schlosser, 411-2.
[r] Entitled *Antirrhetics*.
[s] Walch, x. 694; Neander, v. 270-5; Finlay, ii. 139.
[t] See p. 33.

emperor removed it, under the pretence of rescuing it from such indignities, and issued a commission for taking down images in general, wherever it could be done with safety.[w] Images were broken, burnt, or bedaubed with clay and filth.[x] Many refractory bishops, abbots, and others, were ejected and banished; among the sufferers was the chronicler Theophanes, who died in the island of Samothrace.[y]

At Christmas 814, the emperor went in state to St. Sophia's, havingly previously satisfied Nicephorus that no disorder was to be apprehended by drawing a picture from his bosom and kissing it. He advanced to the altar, and kissed the cloth which covered it, and which was embroidered with a representation of the Nativity.[z] But when, in the course of the service, a denunciation of idolatry by Isaiah was read (xl. 18 seqq.), one of the clergy stept forth, and, addressing the emperor, told him that God, by the prophet's words, commanded him to proceed firmly in his measures for the suppression of image-worship.[a]

Nicephorus fell seriously ill, and it was hoped that his death would spare the emperor the necessity of proceeding against him. But he recovered, and, after many attempts had been made to treat with him, he was deprived, and was shut up in a monastery, where he lived fourteen years longer.[b] John the Grammarian was proposed as his successor, but objections were taken to him as being of too humble birth and too young,[c] and the patriarchate was bestowed on Theodotus Cassiteras, a layman con-
April, 816. nected with the family of the Isaurian emperors, and the same who is said to have prompted the monk by whose prophecies Leo was induced to attempt the suppression of image-worship.[d] Cassiteras gave great offence to the monastic party by his free and secular habits of life.[e] He assembled a synod, which confirmed the judgments of the iconoclastic council of 754, and annulled those of the second Nicene council.[f] The most

[w] Anct. Incert. 438; Schlosser, 412.

[x] Vit. Theodor. 77.

[y] Cedren. 489; Baron. 816. 1-4; Schlosser, 411.

[z] Anct. Incert. 439; Schlosser, 412-3. He omitted this when he next attended the cathedral. Walch supposes that he had done it out of custom, and refrained on finding that his act was misconstrued. x. 675.

[a] See the various accounts in Walch, x, 665. Cedrenus (490) places the scene in the patriarchate of Theodotus: some say that Theodotus was himself the speaker (Walch, x. 628); others name John the Grammarian (ib. 618).

[b] Anct. Incert. 440-1; Walch, 655; Schlosser, 414-5. It is uncertain whether his deprivation was sanctioned by a council. Walch, x. 679, 686.

[c] Anct. Incert. 441.

[d] Baron, 814. 31; Walch, x. 655.

[e] Anct. Incert. 441; Schröckh, xxiii. 362-3.

[f] Walch, x. 691-3.

eminent abbots had been summoned to take part in the synod; but Theodore in their name sent a refusal written in his usual vehement strain, condemning all who should attend, and declaring that he would not share in or regard any measures which might be taken without the consent of the lawful patriarch Nicephorus.[g] Although the public exhibition of images was forbidden, he caused his monks on Palm-sunday to carry all those which belonged to the monastery in solemn procession, and to chant a hymn which began with the words "We adore thine undefiled image."[h]

The emperor, greatly provoked by this defiance, sent Theodore into banishment, where he remained for seven years.[i] He was removed from one place to another; he was often cruelly scourged, even to the danger of his life; his wounds were undressed, nor, when he fell seriously ill, could he obtain any attendance or relief;[k] he suffered from want of food; he was imprisoned for three years in a loathsome dungeon, under ground, and was often threatened with death.[l] But his resolution rose with the severity of his treatment. He declared that he would bear whatever might be inflicted on him, but that nothing should reduce him to silence.[m] He found means of writing and of circulating letters which sustained the determination of his party; he denounced the emperor as a Pharaoh and a Nebuchadnezzar, an enemy of the Saviour and of His Virgin Mother; and the increased punishment which he drew on himself by each offence served only to stimulate him to greater vehemence.[n] He wrote to the bishop of Rome, to the three eastern patriarchs, and to the heads of some important monasteries, representing the oppressions of the church in the most moving terms, and earnestly praying for sympathy.[o]

Paschal, who had just been raised to the papacy, refused to admit the imperial envoys into Rome, sent legates to intercede with Leo for the friends of images, and, in token of the interest which he took in them, built a monastery for Greek refugees, and assigned the new church of St. Praxedis for the performance of service in their own language.[p] The clergy of the party sought ordination in Italy; the laity, instigated by Theodore's teaching, refused religious offices at the hands of the iconoclastic clergy.[q] Leo was more and more exasperated. The worshippers

A.D. 817.

[g] Vita, 79-80.
[h] Vita, 78.
[i] Vita, 81-102.
[k] Vita, 93.
[l] Ib. 90-3.
[m] Ib. 83.
[n] Epp. *passim*; Baron. 815. 18; Schröckh, xxiii. 365-6; Schlosser, 418-423.
[o] Epp. ii. 12-7.
[p] Anastas. 215; Baron. 818. 14-7; Schlosser, 421-3.
[q] Epp. ii. 215, p. 583; Neander, v. 276.

of images were scourged, banished, mutilated, blinded, or put to death; it was ordered that all pictures should be taken down and burnt; spies were employed to discover all who possessed either images or books in defence of them, all who should venture to shelter a fugitive or to relieve a prisoner of the party. All hymns in honour of images were expunged from the liturgy, and care was taken to instil into children, by means of their school-books, an abhorrence of images.[r]

Michael "the Stammerer," a general to whom Leo had been indebted for his throne, at length became discontented, and was convicted, by his own confession, of treasonable designs on the eve of Christmas, 820. He was condemned to death, and Leo would have ordered the execution of the sentence to take place immediately, but for the intercession of his empress, who entreated him to defer it until after the festival. The emperor agreed, but, with a melancholy foreboding, told her that her pious scruples would cost her and her children dear.[s] Michael was confined in the palace, and Leo, anxious to assure himself, went in the middle of the night to look whether he were safe. He found both Michael and the officer who guarded him asleep; but the keeper had resigned his bed to the prisoner, and was lying on the floor. A slave, who was in the room unobserved, recognised the emperor by his purple buskins, and, on his withdrawal, aroused the sleepers. The officer, knowing that he must be considered as an accomplice of Michael, concerted with him a plan for instant action. Under pretence that the prisoner required a confessor, he introduced into the palace one of Michael's partisans, who, on going out, communicated with others. It was the custom to celebrate the earliest service of Christmas-day at three o'clock in the morning; the ivory gate of the palace was opened to admit the clergy and singers, and among them a band of disguised conspirators entered. These attacked the chief chaplain, supposing him to be the emperor, who usually led the psalmody on such occasions; but the priest escaped by uncovering his tonsured head. They then fell on Leo, who for a time defended himself by swinging the chain of a censer, and then, seizing a large cross from the altar, dealt heavy blows around him, until a conspirator of gigantic size disabled him by a stroke which cut off his right hand. On this, the

[r] Schlosser, 423; Schröckh, xxiii. 364; Neander, v. 278-9; Döllinger, ii. 354.

[s] It is said that Leo was about to throw him into the furnace used for heating the baths of the palace (Cedrenus, 492)—"a tale," in Mr. Finlay's opinion, "fitter for the legends of the saints than for the history of the empire." ii. 148.

emperor was immediately despatched; his body was dragged into the circus; Michael, before a smith could be found to release him from his chains, was hastily enthroned; and, on the same day, was crowned in the cathedral.[t]

The friends of images now flattered themselves that Leo's policy would be reversed. The deposed patriarch wrote to request that the emperor would restore the images;[u] while Theodore the Studite warmly congratulated Michael on his accession,[x] and celebrated the murder of Leo with ferocious exultation. "It was right," he said, "that the apostate should thus end his life. It was fitting that in the night death should overtake the son of darkness. It was fitting that he who had desolated the temples of God should see swords bared against himself in God's temple. It was fitting that he should find no shelter from the altar who had destroyed the altar itself, and that that hand should be cut off which had been stretched forth against the holy things. It was fitting that a sword should pierce through the throat which had vomited forth blasphemies." After exercising his rhetoric in this strain, through other points of congruity, Theodore adds, in words which it is possible that he may have himself believed—"I do not mock at the manner of his death, as rejoicing in the fate of the impious man, but I speak in sorrow and with tears. It is because, as He hath said who cannot lie, that wicked man hath been miserably destroyed" (Matth. xxi. 41); and he goes on to express his hope that a new Josiah or Jovian may arise for the restoration of images and of religion.[y]

Michael recalled those who had been banished for their attachment to images, and the return of Theodore was celebrated by a sort of public triumph.[z] But the hopes which had been rashly entertained were soon disappointed. The emperor was a rude soldier; it is said that he could hardly read. His enemies assert that his highest accomplishments consisted in a knowledge of horses, asses, and pigs; and to this it is added, that in early life he had been connected with a strange sect which mixed up Jewish tenets with those of the Athinggani or Paulicians—that he still retained its errors, that he denied our Lord's resurrection and the existence of the devil.[a] The joy of the monastic party

[t] Cedren. 494-6; Gibbon, iv. 418; Schlosser, 427-431.

[u] Walch, x. 706.

[x] Ep. ii. 74.

[y] Ep. ii. 73. There are other scandalous passages of the same kind in Epp. 77 and 80; and an extraordinary accumulation of epithets against Leo in Ep. 75.

[z] Vita, 102, 115.

[a] Cedrenus, 496-9. See Fleury, xliv 44; Walch, x. 629, 706; Schröckh,

was effectually checked when the noted iconomachist Antony of Sylæum was raised in 821 to the patriarchate of Constantinople.[b] Michael declared that he himself had never worshipped any image;[c] he forbade all changes in religion, and all preaching on either side of the question. Both the friends and the opponents of images were to enjoy full liberty of opinion; but no public worship of images was to be allowed in the capital.[d] Thus Theodore and his friends found that, instead of the ascendency which they had expected, they were only to enjoy toleration—and that of a kind which was equal only in name, inasmuch as, while the opposite party lost nothing, they were restrained from the open exercise of the worship which they regarded as essential. They once more refused to confer with their opponents, on the ground that it was unlawful.[e] Theodore repeated to Michael the declaration which he had made to Leo—that earthly princes have no right to meddle with matters of religion. He desired the emperor to restore Nicephorus to the patriarchal throne, or, if he felt any doubt or distrust, to follow the tradition of the fathers by referring the matter to the bishop of Rome, as the inheritor of the Saviour's promise to St. Peter.[f] He met Michael's endeavours at a reconciliation between the parties by labouring to separate the church from the state.[g] He wrote to Marina, the divorced wife of the unfortunate Constantine, whose daughter Michael had taken from a convent to become his second wife,[h] charging her to leave the palace and her daughter's company, because the sword spoken of in the Gospel had now come for the separation of the nearest kindred.[i] The intractable behaviour of Theodore and his followers provoked the emperor to harsh measures. The Studite was once more banished, and died in exile at the age of sixty-nine[k] (A.D. 826).

As the adherents of images relied much on the support of Rome, Michael in 824 sent a legation to pope Paschal, with a view of endeavouring to dissuade him from harbouring refugees of the party.[m] At the same time, he sent ambassadors to Louis the Pious, with a letter in which he announced his accession, and his late

xxiii. 381; Neander, vi. 280; Milman, ii. 195.

[b] Schlosser, 460.

[c] Vit. Theodor. 118.

[d] Cedren. 499; Schlosser, 433, 458.

[e] Theod. Ep. ii. 86.

[f] Ibid.; Schröckh, xxiii. 382.

[g] Schlosser, 459.

[h] Cedren. 511.

[i] Ep. ii. 181. Baronius supposes the letter addressed to the mother-in-law of Leo (816. 23). But Pagi corrects him, and shows that it was not written until 824. xiii. 561.

[k] Ep. ii. 121; Pagi, xiv. 31; Schröckh, xxiii. 382-5.

[m] Schlosser, 461-3.

victory over a rival, Thomas, who for three years had contested the possession of the empire. He clears his faith and his conduct in ecclesiastical matters from misrepresentations which had reached the west, and entreats the Frank emperor to aid him by his influence as lord of Rome with the pope.[n] The letter gives some curious statements of the excess to which the superstition as to images was carried. The cross was turned out of churches, and images were substituted for it; lights and incense were offered, hymns and prayers were addressed to them; they were used as sponsors for children; novices entering into the monastic state, instead of asking religious persons to receive their hair when cut off, allowed it to fall into the lap of images; some of the clergy, in contempt of the public churches, celebrated the Eucharist in houses, using pictures for altars; some scraped off the colours of images, mixed them with the sacramental elements, and administered the mixture to communicants, while others placed the consecrated bread in the hands of the images, and from these the communicants received it.[o] The effect of this embassy fell short of Michael's expectation; but we shall see that it was not unimportant in the history of the western church.

Michael was succeeded in 829 by his son Theophilus. The young emperor had been carefully educated under John the Grammarian. He was a friend of literature, arts, and science; he composed hymns and church-music, and himself led the choir in Divine service.[p] He prided himself on a strict administration of justice, which sometimes became an absurd or cruel pedantry; and his attempts in war against the Saracens resulted in fruitless displays of courage and waste of blood.[q] From the lessons of John he had derived a strong abhorrence of images, and he carried out his views with relentless determination.[r]

His first measure against images was an order, issued on the occasion of a general taxation, that the opinions of every person on the question should be ascertained.[s] He then, in 832, commanded that images should not be reverenced in any way, and that they should not be styled holy, forasmuch as God alone is holy.[t] In the same year, on the death of Antony, he bestowed the patriarchate on his tutor, John,[u] who soon after held a synod at which

[n] The letter is in Goldast, 'Imperialia Decreta,' 611, seqq.; and in Baronius, 824. 18, seqq.

[o] Mich. ap. Baron. 824. 16.

[p] Cedren. 522; Schlosser, 469.

[q] Cedren. 513-4; Gibbon, iv. 420; Finlay, ii. 170-3.

[r] Cedren. 536; Schlosser, 517.

[s] Baron. 830. 2.

[t] Cedren. 518; Schlosser, 519.

[u] Pagi, xiv. 175, 214. John is styled λιχανόμαντις by the opposite party, on

the decrees of the second Nicene council were condemned.[x]

A.D. 833. The emperor then ordered that pictures of animals and other common subjects should be substituted in churches for those of a religious kind;[y] and he proceeded, with great severity, to enforce obedience. Many of the image party were imprisoned or banished.[z] Monasteries were to be applied to secular uses, monks were forbidden to wear their habit, such of them as had lived in rural monasteries were not to be admitted into towns, and those who painted images were especially forbidden to exercise their art.[a] The zealous party among the monks, on their side, were as resolute as the emperor. Many of them went to him, and told him to his face that he was accursed for interfering with a worship which was derived from St. Luke, from the Apostles, and the Saviour himself.[b] A monastic artist, named Lazarus, persisted in painting, notwithstanding repeated threats. He was cruelly beaten, and, as soon as he had recovered in some degree, resumed his occupation. He was again seized; by way of disabling him, his hands were seared with hot plates of iron, and it was with difficulty that his life was saved through the intercession of the empress Theodora. But he took refuge in a church of St. John the Baptist, and there painted a picture which soon acquired the reputation of miraculous power.[c] Two other monks, brothers, named Theodore and Theophanes, were summoned to the emperor's presence. Theophilus was fond of displaying his learning and ability in disputation, and was provoked at finding that the monks did not yield with the same facility to which he had been accustomed in his courtiers. He ordered that each of them should receive two hundred lashes, and should afterwards be branded on the forehead with twelve iambic verses of his own composition.[d] Yet, notwithstanding these and many other severities, it does not appear that any persons suffered death in this reign on account of an attachment to images.[e]

account of an alleged practice of divining by means of a bason. He is also called by the name of the Egyptian magician Jannes. (2 Tim. iii. 8.) Cedren. 536.

[x] Schlosser, 519.

[y] Schlosser, 520-1.

[z] Cedren. 518.

[a] Cedren. 518.

[b] Cedren. 519; Schlosser, 520.

[c] Cedren. 520; Baron. 832. 5.

[d] Cedren. 520-1; Baron. 835. 35. It does not seem impossible (as some writers have supposed) to find room for the verses on the tonsured heads of the monks, if a small letter were used. This difficulty is not raised by the ancient authorities; and, at least, the branding is certain.

[e] Giesseler, II. i. 11. Schlosser (517, 524), Mr. Finlay (ii. 178), and Dean Milman (ii. 197) agree in denying that there is any authority for Gibbon's statement (iv. 494) as to the extreme cruelty of the punishments inflicted by Theophilus.

But within the emperor's immediate circle the worship of images was secretly practised. In the beginning of his reign, his stepmother, Euphrosyne, the daughter of Constantine VI. and his Armenian empress,[f] had caused the noblest maidens of the empire to be assembled in order that Theophilus might select a consort from among them. Struck with the beauty of Icasia, he was about to bestow on her the golden apple, which was the symbol of his choice, when he paused for a moment, and said, as if unconsciously uttering his thought—"Of how much evil have women been the cause!" Icasia answered the reference to Eve with an allusion to the Redemption—"Yes; and of how much greater good!" But the emperor took alarm at this excessive readiness of repartee; he gave the apple to Theodora, a candidate of less brilliant and more domestic character; and Icasia sought consolation in founding a monastery, where she lived for the cultivation of learning.[g] Theodora had been brought up in the worship of images. Her mother,[h] who was devoted to them, secretly kept a number of them, and, when the emperor's children visited her, she used to bring forth the images, and offer them to be kissed. Theophilus, by questioning the children, discovered that their grandmother was in the habit of amusing them with *dolls*. He strictly forbade them to visit her again, and she had difficulty in escaping punishment.[i] Theodora herself was detected in paying reverence to images by a dwarf, who was kept about the court as a jester. Theophilus, on hearing his tale, rushed in a fury to the empress's apartment, but the images were not to be found, and the dwarf was silenced for the future by a whipping.[k]

Theophilus died in January, 842. Fearing, on his deathbed, for the empire which he was about to leave to women and young children, he endeavoured to secure it by the death of his brother-in-law, Theophobus, a descendant of the Persian kings, who had distinguished himself by military services. The head of Theophobus was cut off in prison,[m] and was carried to the emperor; and, with his hand on it, he expired.[n]

It is said that Theophilus, with a view to the continuance of his ecclesiastical policy, had bound Theodora and the senate by oath

[f] Theophilus afterwards sent Euphrosyne back to her nunnery. Cedren. 514.

[g] Zonaras, ap. Baron. t. xiv. 151; Gibbon, iv. 421.

[h] See Cedren. 545; Walch, x. 520.

[i] Cedren. 515 6; Joh. Curopal. ap. Baron. 831. 2.

[k] Joh. Curopal. in Baron. 831. 3-4; Cedren. 516.

[m] Cedrenus (533) says that, according to some, this was done by an officer without orders.

[n] Cedren. 533; Gibbon, iv. 421.

to make no change as to religion.[o] But the guardians of his son Michael were either favourable to images or capable of being gained to the cause.[p] The only seeming exception was Manuel, uncle of the empress. But in a dangerous sickness he was visited by some Studite monks, who promised him life if he would swear to undertake the restoration of images.[q] On his recovery, he went with the other ministers to Theodora, who said that her own wishes had long been in the same direction, but felt herself restrained by her engagements to Theophilus.[r] The revolution was speedily begun. The patriarch John was ejected, not without personal violence,[s] and Methodius, who had been a confessor under the last reign,[t] was put into his place; a synod, to which those who were known as resolute iconomachists were not invited, pronounced in favour of images; but the empress still hesitated, and entreated the assembled clergy to intercede for the forgiveness of her husband's sins. Methodius replied that they could only intercede for those who were yet on earth; that, if Theophilus had died in his error, his case was beyond the power of the Church. Thus urged, Theodora ventured on the fiction that the emperor, before his death, had expressed repentance for his measures; that he had asked for some images, and had kissed them with ardent devotion. The patriarch, on this, assured her that, if it were so, he would answer for her husband's salvation.[u] There was now no further hindrance to the restoration of images. Those of the capital were re-established with great solemnity on the first Sunday in Lent[x]—a day which was styled the Feast of Orthodoxy, and has ever since been celebrated by the Greeks under that name, although with a wider application of the term.[y] The bodies of Nicephorus, Theodore the Studite, and other eminent friends of images, who had died in exile, were translated to the capital.[z] The sees were filled with members of the triumphant party, and among them was the branded monk Theophanes, who obtained the bishoprick of Nicæa. The empress, at a banquet, expressed to him her regret for the cruelty with which her husband had treated him.

[o] Cedren. 528, 533; Walch, x. 720.

[p] Schlosser, 544-5.

[q] Cedren. 534. See Walch, x. 769.

[r] Cedren. 535; Walch, x. 787, 790.

[s] For the tricks imputed to John—wounding himself, and pretending that his enemies had assaulted him, &c., see Cedren. 535; Walch, x. 771.

[t] Cedren. 521-2.

[u] Constant. Porphyrog. in Walch, x. 734; Pagi, xiv. 264; Schröckh, xxiii. 392; Schlosser, 548-552.

[x] This is generally placed in 842; but, as in that year Theophilus died on Jan. 20, and the first Sunday of Lent was Feb. 20, Walch says that the solemnity must be put off to 843. x. 743. See Pagi, xiv. 267.

[y] Walch, x. 804-8.

[z] Walch, x. 780.

"Yes," he said, "for this I will call him to account at the righteous judgment-seat of God!" Theodora was struck with horror, but the patriarch Methodius reassured her by blaming the vehemence of his brother, and by repeating his declaration that Theophilus was safe.[a]

The worship of images—although only in the form of painting, not of sculpture[b]—has ever since been retained by the Greeks. The opposition to it had not proceeded from the people, but from the will of the emperors; and when the imperial authority was steadily exerted in favour of images, the iconomachist party became, not indeed immediately,[c] but within no long time, extinct.[d]

III. The opinion of the Frankish church as to images had continued in accordance with the council of Frankfort, when the embassy from the Greek emperor Michael,[e] in 824, led to a fresh examination of the question. Louis had such confidence in the correctness of the Frankish view as to hope that, if care were taken to avoid all cause of irritation, even the pope himself might be brought to agree in it. He therefore, after having received the Greek ambassadors, sent some envoys of his own to Rome in their company, with a request that Eugenius, who had just succeeded Paschal, would allow the clergy of Gaul to collect the opinions of the fathers on the subject.[f] Having, by this show of deference to the pope, guarded against offence in the outset, Louis summoned an assembly which met at Paris in 825.[g] The bishops drew up a collection of authorities, and forwarded it to the emperor, with a letter in which they censure both the extreme parties among the Greeks. They distinguish, as the Caroline Books had done, between paying reverence to the Cross and to images,[h] and, declare the opinion of the fathers to be, that images are not to be

[a] Cedren. 539.

[b] The Greeks have a saying that it is unlawful to worship any image whose nose may be seized with two fingers. Some Romanists attack the inconsistency of the Greeks even more than the entire opposition of Protestants. Schröckh, xxiii. 394.

[c] See below, c. iii.; Walch, x. 818.

[d] Gieseler, II. i. 12; Neander, vi. 287; Milman, ii. 200.

[e] See p. 256.

[f] Baron. 824. 31; Schröckh, xxiii. 397.

[g] The letters of Louis to Eugenius and to his own commissioners are in Hardouin, but Mansi is the only editor of the Councils who includes this. Most of the documents are given by Baronius, 824-5, and the whole by Goldast, 626, seqq. On the attempts of Romanists to suppress them, or to deny their genuineness, see Walch, xi. 96; Schröckh, xxiii. 406. Baronius contents himself with abusing the anonymous first editor—"Arguendus est iste filius esse tenebrarum, qui tenebricosum opus, perpetuis tenebris dignum a majoribus habitum et abditum, obscuriate nominis, et loci unde prodierit, totum densa effasum caligine in odium et invidiam Catholici nominis sparserit," &c. 825. 2.

[h] Goldast. 683; Baron. 825. 13.

worshipped or adored, but to be used for loving remembrance of the originals. They strongly censure Pope Adrian's manner of answering the Caroline Books; but they suggest that his reference to his predecessor Gregory the Great, in behalf of opinions widely different from those which that father really held, proves his error to have been not wilful but committed in ignorance.[j] They congratulate Louis on the prospect which the Greek application affords him of being able to mediate between the opposite parties, to convince the pope himself, and to bring both to an agreement in the truth.[k] They send him a sketch of a letter to the pope, drawn up with an extreme anxiety to avoid all risk of a collision. The emperor is made to extol the position and authority of the "supreme pontiff," the "Universal Pope," as having the means of reconciling the intolerant factions of the Greeks;[m] he will not presume to dictate, but only ventures on suggestions; he speaks of the assembly of Paris as not a synod, but merely a conference of his friends, the children of the apostolic father:[n] they even go so far as to draw up a letter which the pope himself might subscribe and send to Constantinople—forbidding all superstitious as to images on the one hand, and all acts of contempt or outrage against them on the other.[o]

Two bishops, Jeremy of Sens and Jonas of Orleans, were sent to Rome with a letter, entirely different from the draft which the council had supplied.[p] The emperor requests Eugenius to mediate between the friends and the enemies of images, and offers that his own envoys may accompany those whom the pope should send to Constantinople. The instructions given to Jeremy and Jonas[q] direct them to deal very carefully with the pope. They are not to show him any parts of the documents drawn up at Paris which might be distasteful to him; they are to avoid everything which might possibly jar on the characteristic obstinacy of the Romans,[r] and thus might provoke him to some irrevocable act; they are to present the matter to him in such a way that, instead of supposing the truth to be forced on him, and thence conceiving a prejudice against it, he may imagine it to be his own discovery.

[j] Bar. 825. 8.

[k] Ib. 11.

[m] Goldast. 720-1.

[n] Ib. 722. This distinction (which, after all, does not appear in the letter actually sent) is absurdly dwelt on as important by Baronius (825. 1) and other Romanists. See Walch, xi. 135.

[o] Goldast. 723, seqq. See Walch, xi. 128.

[p] Hard. iv. 1259.

[q] Hard. iv. 1260.

[r] "Pertinacia Romana." Baronius contends that in that age *pertinacia* was equivalent to *constantia*. Very possibly; but only with those who were guilty of it, not with those who charged it on others.

The result of this mission is but imperfectly known. The Romans adhered to their former views; yet Eugenius made no such demonstration against Louis as his predecessors had made against the eastern emperors; nor did he even attempt to answer him, as Adrian had answered Charlemagne.[s] The envoys whom Louis sent to the east were well received there, and, as Michael's own views as to images were not extreme, it seems probable that the two imperial courts agreed on the subject.[t] But the Franks were soon after engrossed by domestic troubles which may sufficiently account for the absence of any later communication with the Greeks on the subject of this controversy.

There were, however, some members of the Frankish church, who carried their opposition to images beyond the views which had been sanctioned by the councils of Frankfort and Paris.[u] Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, whose share in the politics of his time has been noticed in the earlier part of this chapter, distinguished himself more creditably by his opposition to prevailing superstitions—as to ordeals,[x] to the expectation of miraculous cures,[y] to the excess of reverence lavished on the tombs of saints,[z] to the belief that storms, diseases of cattle, and other rural troubles were caused by magical art.[a] Among his tracts is one "on the Images of Saints," in which—provoked, as it would seem, by the eastern emperor's report as to the extravagant superstition of the Greeks[b]—he appears altogether to disallow the use of such representations.[c] He quotes largely from older writers, especially from St. Augustine, and shows that the early church had employed images for remembrance only, and not for any religious purpose.[d] In answer to a plea frequently advanced by the advocates of images, he maintains that visible things, even although good in themselves, instead of aiding towards the contemplation of things unseen and spiritual, often act as a hindrance to it.[e] An image, he says, represents the body only; if men were to be worshipped at all, such honour ought rather to be paid to them while alive, and complete in the union of body and soul.[f] He who adores a picture or an image pays his worship not to God, to angels or saints, but

[s] Walch. xi. 138.
[t] Ibid. 132.
[u] See Mabillon, IV. xx.-xxi.
[x] See p. 226.
[y] "Ad Bartholomæum."
[z] "Memoriæ" is thus explained by Baluze, n. on "De Imaginibus," c. 17.
[a] "De Grandine."
[b] Mabillon. IV. xxvi.
[c] Baronius, 825. 63, is much displeased with Agobard.
[d] C. 32.
[e] C. 15.
[f] C. 28. This was also said by Claudius of Turin. (Ap. Jon. Aurelian. in Bibl. Patr. xiv. 174, D.)

to the image itself; to think otherwise is to yield to a delusion of the devil, who aims at the restoration of idolatry.[g] It is as absurd to expect good from religious pictures as it would be to think of recruiting an army by painted soldiers, or to look for the fruits of the earth from a picture of the harvest or of the vintage.[h]

It does not appear that Agobard incurred any censure on account of his opinions as to images; but one of his contemporaries, Claudius of Turin (who, indeed, took up the subject somewhat earlier), by a more thorough and more active opposition to the prevailing religion, occasioned much agitation in the Frankish church.[i] Claudius was by birth a Spaniard, and is said to have been a pupil of Felix of Urgel,[k] although he does not appear to have been a follower of the Adoptionist doctrines. He was a diligent student of St. Augustine, but spoke contemptuously of the other fathers in general;[m] and it would seem that from the doctrines of the great African teacher as to the nothingness of human merit he derived a strong dislike of the current opinions as to the means of sanctity.[n] He had gained reputation by commentaries on Scripture, of which that on the Epistle to the Galatians is still extant.[o] He had been attached to the court of Louis in Aquitaine,[p] and, in the first year of his patron's reign as emperor, was appointed by him to the see of Turin,[q] in the hope that he might be able to effect a reform among his clergy and in the neighbouring district. Claudius accepted the dignity with reluctance.[r] On reaching his diocese he found the churches filled with images and votive offerings.[s] He at once unceremoniously ejected all such ornaments; no distinction was made in favour of historical pictures; and relics and crosses—objects which the eastern iconoclasts had spared—shared the same fate.[t] To worship the images of saints, he said, is merely a renewal of the worship of demons under other names;[u] to worship

A.D. 814.

[g] C. 31.

[h] C. 33.

[i] There is, as Gieseler (II. i. 106) remarks, much verbal agreement between Agobard and Claudius. Our knowledge of Claudius is mostly derived from the treatises of Jonas and Dungal against him—especially from their quotations. They are both in Bibl. Patrum. Lugd. t. xiv. The chief passages of Claudius are given, pp. 197-9.

[k] Jonas, p. 168. Neander (vi. 120) without any ground questions this.

[m] Jonas, 171, b. c.; Dungal, 204, f.; Walch, xi. 181.

[n] Gieseler, II. i. 190.

[o] Jonas, Præf. and p. 168. The Comm. on Gal. is in Bibl. Patr. xiv. 140, seqq.

[p] Præf. ad Comm. in Galat.

[q] Gfrörer places his promotion in 818. iii. 732.

[r] Walch, xi. 178; Schröckh, xxiii. 407.

[s] "Inveni omnes basilicas sordibus anathematum et imaginibus plenas." (Claud. ap. Jon. 170.) Jonas confounds *anathēmata* (votive offerings) with *anathēmata* (curses or cursed things), as if Jonas had applied the latter term to the images. Neander, vi. 123.

[t] Jonas, 168, 170, 174; Walch, xi. 190.

[u] Claud. ap. Jon. 174.

the Cross is to join with the heathen in dwelling on the shame of the Saviour's history, to the exclusion of His glorious resurrection ;[x] and he followed out this by arguing, in a somewhat ribald style, that, if the Cross were to be reverenced on account of its connexion with the Saviour, the same reason would enforce the veneration of all other objects which were mentioned as having been connected with Him.[y] He opposed the worship of saints, applications for their intercession, and the practice of dedicating churches to their honour.[z] He also objected to pilgrimages, although, on being pressed, he said that he did not absolutely either condemn or approve them, because their effects were various in different persons.[a]

The proceedings of Claudius occasioned much excitement. Pope Paschal, on hearing of them, expressed his displeasure, but did not venture to take any active steps against a bishop who had been so lately promoted by the emperor's personal favour. Claudius made light of the papal censure. He declared that the title of *Apostolical* belongs not to him who occupies an apostle's seat, but to one who does an apostle's work ;[b] and he answered the reliance on St. Peter's name, by saying that the power of forgiving sins, which was bestowed on the apostles, belonged to them only during their lifetime, and that on their death it passed to their successors in the true apostleship.[c]

Theodemir, an abbot[d] who had been a friend and admirer of Claudius, on receiving one of his works which was inscribed to himself, took alarm and wrote against him. Claudius defended himself in a scornful and contemptuous tone. He met the charge of impiety by taxing his opponents with superstition and idolatry ; and, in answer to Theodemir's statement that he had founded a sect which had spread into Gaul and Spain, he declared that he had nothing to do with sects, but was devoted to the cause of unity.[e] The controversy was carried further. The Frankish clergy in general, who had at first been disposed to countenance Claudius, now took offence. Some of them requested Louis to examine into the bishop's opinions, and the emperor, with the advice of his

[x] Claud. ap. Jon. 176, c.

[y] Claud. ap. Jon. 178.

[z] Jon. 174.

[a] Claud. ap. Jon. 188, 190. See Walch, xi. 160, 214.

[b] Ap. Jon. 195, g. Jonas answers this in a way which draws from the editors the marginal note, "Caute lege." Claudius was not happy as an etymologist — "Apostolicus dicitur," says he (ibid.), "quasi *Apostoli custos!*" The writing in question was later than the Parisian synod of 825. Pagi, xiv. 72.

[c] Dungal. 214.

[d] Probably of a monastery called *Peulmody*, near Nismes. Hist. Litt. iv. 490 ; Walch, xi. 184.

[e] Claud. ap. Jon. 169-170.

counsellors,[f] pronounced against him. A synod of bishops was then held; Claudius, who had been cited, refused to appear before it, and is said to have spoken of it as an assembly of asses.[g]

Dungal, a deacon of Scottish or Irish birth, who had been established by Charlemagne as a teacher at Pavia,[h] wrote against Claudius in 827, with a great display of learning, but without much critical judgment; he speaks, for example, of images as having been used in the church from the very beginning—"nearly eight hundred and twenty years"—although he produces no instance earlier than Paulinus of Nola, about the year 400.[i] Jonas, bishop of Orleans, one of the commissioners who had been sent to Rome after the synod of Paris, also undertook a refutation of Claudius at the request of Louis.[k] Both Claudius[l] and the emperor died before this was finished, and Jonas had abandoned the work, when he was induced to resume and to complete it by finding that the errors of Claudius continued to be spread by his books and by his pupils.[m] The treatise is dedicated to Charles the Bald: the first book is in defence of images; the second, of the cross; the third, of pilgrimages. Jonas states that Claudius was said to have left writings of an Arian tendency.[n] But, although he is vehement in his opposition to Claudius, he preserves on the subject of images the medium characteristic of the Frankish church, whereas Dungal had approximated to the Nicene view;[o] and he denounces in strong terms the superstitious doctrines and practices of the Greeks.[p] As a lesser matter, it may be mentioned that he makes frequent remarks on the ignorance of Latin style, and even of grammar, which the bishop of Turin had displayed.[q]

Claudius died in possession of his see. In him, as in many other reformers, the intemperance of his zeal marred the goodness of his designs. It has been said that he went to the length of separating his church from the communion of Rome; and the hostility to Roman peculiarities which was afterwards cherished in the Alpine valleys has been traced to him, either as its originator, or as a link in a chain begun by Vigilantius. But, without absolutely

[f] "Palatii sui prudentissimis viris." Jonas, Præf.

[g] Dungal. 223, *g*.

[h] See Walch, xi. 186. Mabillon and the authors of the Hist. Littéraire (iv. 493) wrongly suppose him a monk of St. Denys. Mansi, not. in Baron. xiv. 244. See Lanigan, iii. 256, seqq.

[i] See Walch, xi. 161, 219; Schröckh, xxiii. 414-6.

[k] Jon. Præf.

[l] Claudius died in 839.

[m] Jon. Præf.

[n] Ibid. See Walch, xi. 222-4.

[o] Mabillon, IV. xxi.-xxiii.

[p] "Scelleratissimus error." See p. 168, g. h.; Walch, x[i]. 209.

[q] *E. g.* that he had used *destrui* as a deponent (171, a), and that he had made *fungor* govern an accusative. 195, g.

deciding against such conjectures, we must remember that they have no more certain character.[r]

Notwithstanding the difference on a subject which had elsewhere occasioned so many anathemas, the Frankish church remained in uninterrupted communion with Rome. It continued until nearly the end of the century to adhere to its distinctive view; but about that time a change becomes visible, which gradually assimilated its doctrines on the question of images to those which were sanctioned by the papal authority.[s]

IV. About the time which we have now reached, the law of the Church received an extraordinary addition, which in the sequel produced effects of vast importance. The collection of canons and decretals made by Dionysius Exiguus[t] had been generally used throughout the west. But from the seventh century another collection, which (whether rightly or otherwise) bore the name of Isidore of Seville, had been current in Spain; and, as it contained some pieces which were not in the compilation of Dionysius, it also found its way into France.[u] The same name was now employed to introduce another set of documents, distinguished by some new and very remarkable features.[x]

The Decretal Epistles in the older collections had begun with pope Siricius, A.D. 385.[y] But the writer who styled himself Isidore produced nearly a hundred letters written in the names of earlier bishops of Rome, from Clement and Anacletus, the contemporaries of the Apostles, with some letters from supposed correspondents of the popes, and the acts of some hitherto unknown councils.[z] The spuriousness of these pieces is established by gross anachronisms, and by other instances of ignorance and clumsiness;[a] as, that persons who lived centuries apart are represented as corresponding with each other;[b] that the early bishops of Rome quote the Scriptures according to St. Jerome's version; and that some of

[r] See Walch, xi. 143; Schröckh, xxiii. 420; Ampère, iii. 88; Milman, ii. 439.

[s] Fleury, xlvii. 5; Mabillon, IV. xvi., xxviii.; Pagi, xiv. 71; Schröckh, xxiii. 247-8.

[t] See vol. i. p. 498.

[u] Planck, ii. 801-6; Gfrörer's Karolinger, i. 96. Bähr (596-7) says that Eichhorn has proved it to have been made between 633 and 636. It was first published by Gonzales, Madrid, 1808.

[x] The pretended compiler is made in some MSS. to style himself "Isidorus *Mercator*." (See Hard. i. 4.) But it is generally agreed that the bishop of Seville was meant, and *mercator* is supposed to be the mistake of a copyist for *peccator*—a term which bishops by way of humility sometimes attached to their names. Schröckh, xxii. 30-1; Gieseler, II. i. 173.

[y] See vol. i. p. 284.

[z] They are in Hardouin, t. i.

[a] Gfrörer's Karolinger, i. 72.

[b] Thus Victor (A.D. 190-202) writes to Theophilus of Alexandria (A.D. 400). Hard. i. 103.

them who lived while Rome was yet heathen, complain of the invasion of church-property by laymen in terms which evidently betray a writer of the Carolingian period.[c] Some of the forgeries included in the work—among them, the Donation of Constantine—were of earlier manufacture;[d] a great part of the other materials has been traced to various sources—to Scripture, to the Latin fathers, to genuine canons and decretals, to the Pontifical books (a set of legendary lives of Roman bishops), and to the service-books of the church. The work of the forger consisted chiefly in connecting these together, and in giving them the appearance of a binding authority.[e]

The date of the composition must be placed between the sixth council of Paris, A.D. 829, from which the forger has borrowed, and that of Kiersy, in 857, where the decretals were cited as authoritative by Charles the Bald.[f] That they were of Frankish origin is proved by certain peculiarities of language;[g] and Mentz is supposed to have been the place of the fabrication. Hincmar says that the collection was brought from Spain by Riculf, who held that see from 787 to 814—a statement which is probably founded on Riculf's having obtained from Spain a copy of the older Isidorian collection.[h] And Benedict, a "Levite" (or deacon) of Mentz, who between 840 and 847 added to the capitularies of Charlemagne and Louis three books of spurious collections, which have much in common with the decretals, states that he chiefly derived his materials from the archives of his cathedral, where they had been deposited by Riculf and had been discovered by the existing archbishop, Autcar or Otgar.[i] This Benedict is commonly regarded

[c] *E. g.* Pius (A.D. 142-157). Ep. ii. col. 97; Urban (A.D. 223-230), col. 115; Gieseler, II. i. 174-5.

[d] See Walter, Kirchenrecht, 184; Gfrörer's Karol. i. 80. There has been much discussion about a set of capitularies said to have been presented by Angilram, of Metz, to Adrian (or by the pope to the bishop), in 785, which have much in common with the forged Decretals. (Hard. iii. 2061-2072.) Wasserschleben in his Gesch. d. Vorgratianischen Rechtsquellen (1839), maintains that they are genuine, and were afterwards interpolated from the Decretals; and in this he is followed by Gfrörer. (Karolinger, i. 77-80.) But they are now more generally regarded as spurious, and as derived from the Decretals. Walter, 212; Bähr, 302; Rettberg, i. 501-9, 652; Gieseler, II. i. 183. The first reference to them is by Hincmar of Laon, about 870.

[e] Planck, ii. 810; Walter, 195-6; Gfrörer, Karolinger, i. 90.

[f] Car. Calv. ap. Pertz, Leges, i. 453; Gieseler, II. i. 181; Gfrörer, Karol. i. 82. It has been said that the Decretals are also indebted to the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 836 (Walter, i. 191-2); but this is questioned. (Gfrörer, 81.) Gfrörer's opinion that Wala used the elements of the forgery at the Field of Lies, in 833, has already been cited, p. 243.

[g] Gfrörer, Karol. i. 91, from Knust, whose work (apparently an important one) I have not seen.

[h] Hincm. Opera, ii. 476; Walter, 187; Gieseler, II. i. 182.

[i] Bened. Levit. ap. Pertz, Leges, II. App. 39. The older genuine collection

as the forger of the decretals; it is said that the likeness between them and his capitularies is such as to indicate that both were the simultaneous productions of the same hand rather than that either was borrowed from the other.[k]

In these decretals, the privileges of the clergy in general, and especially of the bishops, are set very high; and the power of the pope is extended beyond anything that had as yet been known. He appears as the supreme head, lawgiver, and judge of the church, the one bishop of the whole. All causes may be carried to him by appeal; he alone is entitled to decide all weighty or difficult causes.[m] Without his leave, not even provincial councils may be called, nor have their judgments any validity.[n] A very large proportion of the decretals relates to accusations against bishops; indeed almost every one of the popes who are personated has something to say on this subject. Bishops are declared to be exempt from all secular judgment;[o] evil bishops are to be borne as an infliction of Providence, which will redound to the eternal benefit of those who submit to it;[p] the judgment of them is to be left to God.[q] If, however, charges should be brought against a bishop, care is taken, by means of the conditions which are laid down as necessary, to render the prosecution of them almost impossible.[r] No layman may accuse a bishop, or even a clerk; for the disciple is not above his master, nor must the sheep accuse their shepherd.[s] A clerk who would accuse his bishop is infamous, as a son taking arms against his father; and therefore he is not to be heard.[t] In order to prove a bishop guilty, seventy-two witnesses are required;[u] and the qualifications of witnesses are very particularly defined.

of capitularies, by Ansegis, is in Pertz, Leges, i. 257, seqq.; those of Benedict are in the 2nd volume, with a dissertation by Knust, in which they are traced to their sources.

[k] Planck, ii. 311-4. Walter (192), Knust (ap. Pertz, ii. 34), and Gieseler (II. i. 181), however, place the Decretals first. Gfrörer thinks that Benedict was concerned in the original authorship, but that the forgery was probably elaborated in Neustria—the kingdom of Charles the Bald—where it first made any noise; and, if so, that Wenilo of Sens and Rothad of Soissons (personages with whom the next chapter will make us acquainted) were parties to it. Karolinger, i. 112.

[m] Anael. iii. 4 (Hard. i. col. 74); Sixtus, i. (c. 80), ii. (c. 90); Eleutherius, ii. (c. 102); Zephyrinus, c. 106; Fabian, iii. 5 (c. 129); Melchiad. i. (c. 244); Julius, i. 1-2 (c. 558); ii. 2-4 (c. 563), &c.; Planck, ii. 815-6; Gieseler, II. i. 176.

[n] Præf. col. 5; Gieseler, II. i. 180-1.

[o] Pontianus, i. (c. 117.)

[p] Zephyrin. c. 107.

[q] Pius, ii. (c. 96.)

[r] Anaclet. ii. (c. 69); Fabian, ii. 2 (cc. 126-7); Stephan. ii. 11 (c. 564); Julius, ii. 11 (c. 145); Felix, c. 755; Damasus, c. 765, &c.; Planck, ii. 821.

[s] Anaclet. ii. 9 (c. 69-70; Marcellin. ii. 3 (c. 215); Gieseler, II. i. 175-6.

[t] Telesphor. iv. (c. 92); Stephan. ii. 9 (c. 144); Julius, ii. 10 (c. 564).

[u] Zephyrin. c. 105; Sylvester, iii. (cc. 291-2), who also says that there must be 44 against a presbyter—and so on through the lower grades.

There was, however, one grade in the hierarchy on which the decretals bore hardly—the metropolitans. In the Frankish system, the trial of a bishop had belonged to his metropolitan, from whom the last appeal lay to the sovereign;[x] but by the decretals the metropolitan was powerless without the concurrence of his suffragans; he could not even assemble these except by the pope's permission; and all decisive judgment in such matters belonged to the pope alone.[y] And now a broad distinction was drawn between ordinary metropolitans and the higher grade of *primates*, who were distinguished by the commission of vicars under the pope.[z]

It is matter of conjecture in what interest this forgery was originally made[a]—whether in that of the pope, to whom it assigned a supremacy so awful in its alleged origin and unlimited in its extent; or of the bishops, whom it emancipated from all secular control, and also from that of the metropolitans, while it referred their causes to the more distant tribunal of the pope, as the only judge competent to decide them; or whether, without any definite purpose as to the relations of different classes in the hierarchy, it was merely intended to assert the privileges of the clergy against the oppressions which they suffered in the troubled reigns of Charlemagne's successors, and to claim for them a position independent of the secular power. The opinion of the most judicious inquirers appears to point to a combination of the second and third of these motives—that the decretals were fabricated for the benefit of the clergy, and more especially of the bishops; that they were intended to protect the property of the church against invasion, and to fix the privileges of the hierarchy on a basis independent of secular authority; that the metropolitans were especially assailed because they had been the chief instruments by which the Carolingian princes had been able to govern the bishops, to depose such of these as were obnoxious, and to sway the decisions of synods. The popes were eventually the principal gainers by the forgery; but this appears to have been a result beyond the intention of those who planned or who executed it.[b]

[x] See p. 139; and the case of Theodulf, p. 238.

[y] Hyginus, ii. (c. 94); Lucius, iv. (c. 138); Gieseler II. i. 138; Ellendorf, Karolinger, ii. 161-3.

[z] Walter, 197; Gieseler, II. i. 178; Anaclet. ii. (c. 71); Aniect. ii.-iii. (c. 99); Stephan. ii. 6 (c. 144); Julius, ii. 12, 14 (c. 564).

[a] See Schröckh, xxii. 28-9.

[b] See Schmidt, i. 675-8; Planck, ii. 818-824; Guizot, ii. 341; Gieseler, II. i. 174-5; Gfrörer, Karoling. i. 83-8, 92-4; Ellendorf, ii. 167; Milman, ii. 376. The forgery of both the Capitularies and the Decretals seems to have been especially intended to serve the interest of the archbishoprick of Mentz. Other sees had in late times gained various advantages over it; Cologne and Salzburg had become metropolitan, and Otgar had reason to fear the dismember-

That the author's design was, as he himself professes,[c] to supply a digest of the existing ecclesiastical laws—to promote the advancement of religion and morality—will hardly be believed on his own authority, although in our own time the assertion has found champions whose ability is more evident than their sincerity.[d] Yet we may do well not to judge him too severely for his imposture, but are bound to remember the vicious principles which his age had inherited from several centuries which preceded it as to the lawfulness of using falsehood for purposes which were supposed to be good: nor, although he differed from other forgers in the greatness of the scale on which he wrought, and although his forgery has exceeded all others in the importance of the results, would it be easy to show any essential moral difference between his act and the acts of others who had fabricated documents of less extent, or the innumerable legendary writers who imposed on the world fictions as to the lives and miracles of saints.

It has been argued in the Roman interest, that the Decretals made no change in the actual system of the church.[e] The only considerable new claim, it is said, which they made in behalf of the pope was that as to provincial councils; and this, it is added, never actually took effect.[f] The answer which has been truly made that the system of the Decretals was a direct reversal of that which immediately preceded them in the government of the

ment of his province and the loss of his position in the German hierarchy. Hence the distinction between metropolitans and the higher dignity of *primates*—among whom, as successor of St. Boniface, he might reasonably hope to gain a place. (Blasco, cited by Gieseler, II. i. 178; Knust, ap. Pertz, Leges, ii. App. 38; Gfrörer, Karol. i. 98-102.) In like manner Prof. Gfrörer would account for the part which he supposes Wenilo, another metropolitan, to have taken as to the Decretals by supposing that he aimed at acquiring the degree of primate, which was afterwards bestowed on Ansegis, one of his successors in the archbishopric of Sens. i. 462.

[c] Præf. 4, e.

[d] As Walter (195) and Möhler ('Fragmente aus und über Pseudoisidor,' in vol. i. of his 'Aufsätze'). Möhler maintains that the writer's object was to combat Arian and other heresy (287)—to supply a manual of orthodoxy, practical religion, morality, and pastoral care (288, 308). He speaks of him as a poet or novelist (*Dichter*), and of his work as *dieses Poëm* (297-8). He supposes him to have been a sincerely pious man, who had no intention of deceiving (305), but adopted the form of a fiction because he used the labours of others (308); and that he was obliged to suit himself to the circumstances of his own time by representing popes as having been from the beginning the general oracles of Christendom (294). It is a pity that the ingenious author of this theory was unable to illustrate it by the story of Solomon Spaulding's romance, which, in other hands, became the book of a new revelation. Ellendorf answers Möhler at some length, ii. 175-186. That the moral and religious lessons were merely the framework, appears, he says, from the fact that they are but a third of the whole. (175-6.) Laden, in the tone which he usually affects in speaking of the mediæval church, goes far to extenuate the imposture. v. 472-6.

[e] Döllinger, ii. 41-3; Walter, 196, seqq. Rohrbacher is worthy of himself on this point. xvi.

[f] Walter, 201.

Frankish church[g]—is even narrower than the proposition which it is intended to meet. But to rest such a proposition on a dissection of the Decretals is obviously a fallacy. Although it may be shown in detail that this or that portion of them was older—that what was now laid down universally had before been said with a more limited application—that claims had been made, that jurisdiction had been exercised; although, in truth, the main outline of the papacy had been marked out four centuries earlier by Leo the Great;—the consolidation of the scattered fragments into one body, the representation of the later papal claims as having come down by unbroken tradition in the character of acknowledged rights from the Apostolic times, could not but produce a vast effect, and the difference between the earlier and the following history abundantly proves their influence.

The history of the introduction of these documents in France and at Rome will be given in the next chapter. Published in an uncritical age, they bespoke a favourable reception by holding out to various classes redress of their grievances and increase of their privileges.[h] Even those who were galled by them in one respect were glad, like Hincmar of Rheims, to make use of them where it was convenient to do so. They were therefore admitted without any expressed doubt of their genuineness, although some questions were raised as to their application or obligatory power. In the next century, they were cited in a collection of canons by Regino, abbot of Prüm.[i] Gratian made them the foundation of his "Decretum," the great lawbook of the church during the middle ages, and accommodated to their principles all the more genuine matter which he admitted.[k] Although sometimes called in question during the long interval before the Reformation,[m] they yet maintained their public credit; and, while the foundation has long been given up, even by the extremest writers of the Roman church, the superstructure yet remains.[n]

[g] Ellendorf, ii. 86.

[h] Ellendorf, ii. 145.

[i] Schröckh, xxii. 412; Planck, ii. 825-6.

[k] Schröckh, xxii. 32.

[m] See Schröckh, xxii. 34; Gieseler, II. i. 188.

[n] Erasmus and Calvin declared them spurious, but the first attempt at critical proof of it was in the Magdeburg "Centuries." Torres, a Jesuit, replied; but Blondel answered him in a manner which Walter (190) admits to be conclusive.

CHAPTER II.

THE FRANKISH CHURCH AND THE PAPACY, FROM THE DEATH OF LOUIS THE PIOUS TO THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT.

A.D. 840-887.

THE history of the Carolingians after the death of Louis the Pious is marked by a continuance of those scandalous enmities between the nearest kinsmen which had given so unhappy a character to his reign. Sometimes these enmities were carried out into actual war; but after the battle of Fontenay, in 841, where the loss is said to have amounted to 40,000 on one side, and on the other to 25,000 or 30,000,[a] they more commonly took the form of intrigues, of insincere alliances, and selfish breaches of treaties.

Charlemagne had found great difficulty in keeping together the very various elements of his vast empire. When he led his troops into any quarter, for the purpose of conquest or of suppressing rebellion, an insurrection usually broke out behind him.[b] In order to conciliate the nationalities which were united under his sceptre, he appointed kings to govern them, as in Aquitaine and in Italy. By his system, which was continued under Louis, these kings were to be subordinate to the "senior" or head of the family; the whole empire was to be regarded as one, subject to the chief.[c] But in the beginning of the period now before us, this system is broken up; the delegated government by kings is found to have been the means of organising the different nations for resistance to the idea of unity, and for asserting their independence of each other.[d] Language played an important part in the dissolution of the empire.[e] From the time of the Frank conquest of Gaul, Latin had been the language of the church and of the state, while German had been that of the army. The king and the nobles were familiar with both; but in the south the Latin—

[a] Martin, ii. 560. These numbers are beyond the truth, and perhaps the effects of the battle have been exaggerated. Luden, v. 416.

[b] Lehuërou, Institut. Mérov. et Carol. ii. 558-9.

[c] Gfrörer, i. 64.

[d] Lehuëron, ii. 557.

[e] See Guizot, ii. 285-290.

(or rather the "rustic Roman," which differed from the more correct official Latin)—was native, and the German was acquired by learning, while the reverse was the case in the northern and eastern territories.[f] The populations which used these different languages as their mother-tongues now became separate. At the treaty of Strasburg, in 842, Louis of Bavaria took an oath in German, and Charles of Neustria in the Romance dialect,[g] and they addressed their subjects in the same tongues respectively. The Romance oath is the oldest monument of French; the other is the oldest specimen of German after the baptismal renunciation of St. Boniface's time.[h] A like scene was repeated at Coblentz, in 860.[i]

The treaty of Verdun, by which the empire was divided in 843 between the three sons of Louis, established each of them in entire independence. The portion of the second brother, Louis, may be broadly spoken of as *Germany;* Charles the Bald's share may with a like latitude be styled *France;*[k] while Lothair, the emperor, had a territory lying between the two—long and narrow, reaching from the mouths of the Weser and the Scheldt to the frontier of the duchy of Benevento, and including the two imperial cities—Rome, the ancient capital of the world, and Aix, the chief seat of Charlemagne's sovereignty. The Rhine served for a considerable part of its course as the eastern boundary of this territory; but a deviation was made from it, in order that Louis might include within his dominions the ecclesiastical metropolis of Germany, Mentz, the see of Boniface, with the suffragan dioceses of Worms and Spires, while this cession was compensated to Lothair by a tract to the east of the river in the lower part of its course.[m] Lothair's kingdom, not being marked out by any older boundaries of population or language, was called from him *Lotharingia.*[n] By a later partition (A.D. 870), the portion of it north of the Alps was divided between Louis and Charles the Bald, when Louis added to his dominions the countries of the German and

[f] Sismondi, iii. 59-60; Gfrörer, i. 34.

[g] They are given by Nithard, iii. 5, in Pertz, Scriptores, ii. 665-6, with notes by J. Grimm.

[h] See p. 102, note 9; Bähr, 62.

[i] Pertz, Leges, i. 473.

[k] The Gauls, unwilling to renounce the glory of three centuries and a half, now styled themselves *Franks*, and their country *Francia*, while the eastern Franks began to be called *Germans*. Sismondi, iii. 9-10.

[m] Gfrörer, i. 21-2, 54, 58. See the second map of Germany in Spruner's admirable atlas, pt. II.

[n] Gfrörer, i. 57. Hence the name of *Lorraine*, afterwards given to a part of it. Some writers have supposed that Lotharingia was called after the younger Lothair, son of the emperor; but see Bouquet, vii. 188.

Belgic tongues, and Charles acquired those in which the Romance prevailed.[o]

The feeling of nationality also showed itself in the rebellion of the Bretons under Nomenoë, who compelled Charles to acknowledge him as king, and established a new hierarchy under the archbishop of Dol, independent of the Roman connexion;[p] in the revolts of the Saxons, who killed or drove out their governors, and resumed the profession of paganism;[q] and in the subdivision of France towards the end of the century into a great number of petty principalities, although other causes concurred to this result.[r]

Charlemagne had endeavoured to provide a defence against the northern pirates by fortifying the mouths of rivers; but this policy was now neglected.[s] No longer content with ravaging the coasts, the fierce barbarians of the north made their way in their "serpent"[t] barks up every river whose opening invited them, from the Elbe to the Adour. They repeatedly plundered the more exposed cities, such as Hamburg, Dorstadt, and Bordeaux; they ascended the Rhine to Mentz, and even to Worms; the Moselle to Treves; the Somme to Amiens; the Seine to Rouen and thence to Paris, once the Merovingian capital, and still the chief city of Neustria, rich in churches and in treasures, and with the royal monastery of St. Denys in its immediate neighbourhood; the Loire to Tours,[u] the city of St. Martin, and to Orleans.[x] They went on to the Spanish peninsula, plundered Lisbon, passed the strait of Gibraltar, and successfully encountered the Arabs of Andalusia.[y] Even the coast of Italy felt their fury.[z] Everywhere they pillaged, burnt, slew, and carried off captives. After a time, growing bolder through impunity, they used to leave their vessels on the greater rivers, and strike across the unresisting country to pillage inland places of noted wealth—such as Ghent, Beauvais, Chartres, Bourges, Rheims, Laon, and Charlemagne's own city of Aix. They established permanent camps, and ravaged in a wide circle around them.[a] Many of these pirates were exiles or adven-

[o] Pertz, Leges, i. 517; Palgrave, Norm. and Eng. i. 370.

[p] Sismondi, iii. 90; Wiltsch, i. 471.

[q] Sism. iii. 74.

[r] See Guizot, ii. 280; Stephen, i. 112.

[s] Michelet, ii. 136.

[t] *Snekkar*, *drakar*. Depping, i. 71-2; Snorro Sturleson, by Laing, i. 441.

[u] Baron. 845. 29, seqq., and Pagi's notes.

[x] Sismondi, iii. 85-7. For a list of places plundered by the Northmen, see Palgrave, Normandy and England, i. 419-20, 582; for further details, Depping, Expéditions Maritimes des Normands. Paris, 1826.

[y] Depping, i. 134-5.

[z] Ib. 165-9.

[a] Sismondi, iii. 120.

turers who had fled from other countries to the regions of the north;[b] many were men, or the offspring of men, who had suffered from the forcible means employed by Charlemagne for the conversion of the pagans. Their enmity against Christianity was therefore fierce and unsparing; there was religious hatred, as well as the lust of spoil, in the rage which selected churches and monasteries as its especial objects. Wherever the approach of the Northmen was reported, the monks deserted their abodes, and fled, if possible, leaving their wealth to the invaders, and anxious only to rescue the relics of their patron saints.[c] The miseries caused by these ravages was extreme. From dread of them, husbandry was neglected, and frequent famines ensued.[d] Even wolves were allowed to prey and to multiply without any check.[e] Aquitaine was reduced to such a state, that a bishop was translated from Bordeaux to Bourges, on the ground that his former diocese was rendered utterly desert by the pagans.[f] Many monks who had been driven from their cells threw off the religious habit, and took to a vagabond life.[g] And a striking proof of the terror inspired by the invaders is found in the insertion of a petition in the Gallican liturgies for deliverance "From the fury of the Northmen."[h]

However divided by dissensions among themselves, the Northmen always acted in concert as to the course which their expeditions should take. They kept a watch on the movements of the Carolingian princes, and were ready to take advantage in every quarter of their discords and of their weakness.[i] Sometimes, it would seem, they were not only attracted by the hope of booty, but were bribed by one of Charlemagne's descendants to attack the territories of another.[k]

[b] Thus, one of the Hastingses (for of that name there were three famous sea-kings) is said to have been a native of the diocese of Troyes, of servile birth. Glaber Radulph. i. 5, ap. Bouquet, x. 9; Cf. Depping, i. 121-3; Palgrave, 490.

[c] Sismondi, iii. 79.

[d] Ibid. 119.

[e] Palgrave, i. 432.

[f] Joh. VIII. Epp. 1, 4, 5, 12, ap. Hard. vi.

[g] Conc. Duziac. A.D. 860, c. 5.

[h] Palgrave, i. 460.

[i] Luden, vi. 14; Palgrave, i. 320, 425-8.

[k] Luden, vi. 171. This is much insisted on by Gfrörer (e. g. Karol. i. 20, 135, 158, 411), and perhaps Dean Milman may have gone too far in altogether setting aside his views on the subject (ii. 430). I must, however, confess that I am unable to follow the historian of Latin Christianity in his general estimate of this writer, whose constant straining after originality, and parade of a paradoxical acuteness, interfere very seriously with the respect which his knowledge and abilities might claim; while his frequent changes of opinion—beginning in Rationalism, and resulting for the present in Romanism—destroy all confidence in his judgment.

The martial spirit of the Franks had been exhausted by the slaughter of Fontenay.[m] Many of the free landholders—the body on which the old Frankish system mainly relied for national defence—sought a refuge from the miseries of the time by becoming serfs to abbots or to nobles who were strong enough to protect them; and thus their military service was lost.[n] The Franks were distracted by faction, and instead of combining to resist the common enemy, each party and each class was intent on securing its own selfish interests. The nobles in general stood aloof, and looked on without dissatisfaction while the Northmen pillaged towns or estates which belonged to the crown or to the church.[o] In a few cases, the invaders met with a vigorous resistance—as from Robert "the Strong," the ancestor of the Capetian line,[p] and from his son Odo or Eudes, who, with the bishop, Gauzelin, valiantly defended Paris in 885.[q] But a more usual course was that of paying them a large sum as an inducement to depart for a time—a system which pressed heavily on the people, who were taxed for the payment, while it ensured the return of the enemy after a short respite. A better, although not uniform, success attended the attempt to appease the northern chiefs with grants of land. They settled on these estates; they and their followers were baptised, took wives of the country, by means of whom the northern language was soon extinguished among their offspring; they became accustomed to their new homes, and gradually laid aside their barbarian ferocity.[r]

To the east, the Slave populations pressed on the German portion of the empire, and engaged its sovereigns in frequent wars;[s] and on the south of France, as well as in Italy, the Saracens were a foe not less terrible than the Northmen on the other coasts of the empire. An expedition from Spain had made them masters of Crete in 823. Four years later they landed in Sicily, and, by degrees, they got possession of the whole island, although it was not until after half a century (A.D. 876) that Syracuse fell into their hands.[t] They seized on Cyprus and Corsica, devastated the

[m] Regino, Ann. 842 (Pertz, i. 568); Sismondi, iii. 865.

[n] Sismondi, iii. 168; Hallam, M. A. i. 16. The change took place chiefly between 830 and 860. Gfrörer, i. 390.

[o] Luden, vi. 182; Gfrörer, i. 274, 281-2.

[p] Palgrave, i. 486.

[q] Annal. Vedast. (Pertz, i. 522-3); Depping, ii. 2, seqq.; Palgrave, i. 685, seqq.

[r] Sismondi, iii. 114, 184-5; Palgrave, i. 503; Michelet, ii. 134-7.

[s] Luden, vi. 35; Palgrave, i. 410, seqq.

[t] Cedren. 508, 512; Gibbon, v. 200-9; Famin, Invasions des Sarrazins en Italie, i. 140, 116, 347, 395. Paris, 1843.

Mediterranean coast of France,[u] sailed up the Tiber, carried off the altar which covered the remains of St. Peter, and committed atrocious acts of rapine, lust, and cruelty.[x] The terror inspired by these adventurers—the offscourings of their race, which in Spain and in the East had begun to cultivate science and literature[y]—drove the inhabitants of the defenceless towns to seek a refuge in woods and among mountains.[z] Some of the popes showed much energy in providing the means of protection against them. Gregory IV. rebuilt and fortified Ostia, to which he gave the name of Gregoriopolis.[a] Leo IV., who was hastily raised to the papal chair on an emergency when the Saracens threatened Rome, took very vigorous measures. He fortified Portus, in which he planted a colony of Corsican refugees; drew a chain across the mouth of the Tiber, and repaired the walls of Rome. With the approbation of the emperor Lothair, who contributed largely to the expense, he enclosed within a wall the Transtiberine district which contained the church of St. Peter and the English Burg,[b] and to this new quarter he gave the name of the "Leonine City."[c] Nicolas I. also contributed to the defence of Rome by strengthening the fortifications and the garrison of Ostia.[d] But in the south of Italy the Saracens were triumphant. They established a sultan at Bari, although after a time that city was recovered from them by the united forces of the emperors Louis II. and Basil the Macedonian.[e] Naples, Amalfi, Salerno, and other cities, finding resistance impossible, entered into alliance with them, and joined them in plundering. But for dissensions among themselves, the Moslems would probably have become masters of the whole peninsula.[f]

A.D. 852.

The royal power in France suffered greatly from the changes of this period. The counts had originally been not landholders, but officers of the sovereign, invested with a dignity which was only personal and temporary. But from the time of the civil wars between Louis the Pious and his sons, the Frankish princes found themselves obliged to pay those on whom they depended for

[u] Marseilles, which had suffered from them in 838, was again plundered by Greek pirates ten years later. Sismondi, iii. 92.

[x] A.D. 846. Chron. Cassin. ap. Pertz, iii. 225-230; Sismondi, iii. 89.

[y] Sismondi, Rép. Ital. i. 27.

[z] Anastas. 244.

[a] Ib. 226.

[b] See p. 221.

[c] Anastas. 240-3; Gibbon, v. 209-210.

[d] Anastas. 260.

[e] Sismondi, Rép. Ital. i. 164; Famin, i. 298.

[f] Erchempert, A.D. 876, ap. Pertz. iii.; Gibbon, v. 209.

support by a diminution of their own prerogatives and property.[g] The system was continued; and, at the diet of Kiersy, in 877, Charles the Bald, with a view of securing the consent of his nobles to his projected expedition into Italy, granted that their lands should descend by inheritance, and only reserved to the sovereign the choice of a successor in cases where the tenant should die without male issue;[h] and, as we shall see hereafter, in his eagerness to gain aid towards the extension of his dominions, he even consented that his crown should be regarded as elective.[i] The nobles became more independent; they took advantage of the weakness of the sovereign, and, by the end of the century, the dismemberment of the empire had been so much imitated on a smaller scale that France was broken up into no fewer than twenty-nine independent states.[k]

The Frankish clergy suffered severely in their property during the troubles of the time. The old system of rewarding partisans with gifts of ecclesiastical benefices was continued by Louis and his sons, and was even carried further than before, by being extended to religious houses which had, until then, been regarded as exempt from this kind of danger. The abbey of St. Martin's itself—the most revered, as well as the richest, of all the sanctuaries of Gaul—was granted by Charles in benefice to Robert the Strong.[m] Almost every council has its piteous complaint that the property of the church is invaded in a manner more fitting for pagan enemies than for her own sons; that the poor, the strangers, the pilgrims, the captives, are deprived of the endowments founded for their relief; that hospitals, especially those of the Scots, are diverted from their object, so that not only are guests not entertained, but those who had dwelt in them from infancy are turned out to beg from door to door; that some lands are alienated in such a way as to cut off all hope of recovery; that the sovereigns grossly abuse their patronage by bestowing spiritual offices on laymen.[n] The only weapon which the church could wield against the rapacious laity was excommunication; but neither

[g] Planck, iii. 18; Sismondi, iii. 221-2; Funck, 184.

[h] Pertz, Leges, i. 539, c. 9. See Sismondi, iii. 218; Stephen, i. 126; Gfrörer, ii. 149, who shows that the effect of this concession was general, although in words it was granted to such only as should take part in the Italian expedition.

[i] Sismondi, iii. 223; Gfrörer, ii. 280.

[k] Guizot, ii. 280.

[m] Palgrave, i. 466, 488.

[n] Conc. Aquisgr. A.D. 836, iii. 19; Conc. Theod-vill. A.D. 844, c. 3 (Pertz, Leges, i. 381); Conc. Vern. II. A.D. 844, cc. 12, &c. (ib. 383-5); Conc. Sparnac. A.D. 846 (ib. 389-90); Conc. Meld. A.D. 845, cc. 40, 41, 75, &c.; Conc. Carisiac. A.D. 858, Ep. ad Ludov. (Hard. v. 466, seqq.); Conc. Sparnac.

spiritual terrors, nor tales of frequent judicial miracles were sufficient to check the evil.[o] Another frequent complaint relates to the decay of literature.[p] Charles the Bald was a patron of learned men, and took pleasure in their society; but, while literature enjoyed this courtly and superficial encouragement, the institutions by which Charlemagne had endeavoured to provide for the general instruction of his subjects were allowed to fall into neglect.[q]

But in other respects the clergy gained greatly. The sixth council of Paris, in 829, had asserted for them a right to judge kings.[r] This power had been exercised against Louis by the rebellious bishops at Compiègne, and his restoration had not been accomplished without a formal act of the church.[s] Charles the Bald admitted it, as against himself,[t] at the council of Savonnières, in 859; and in all the disagreements of the Carolingians, each prince carried his grievances to the pope—thus constituting the Roman see a general court of appeal, and weakening the right of all sovereigns by such submission. Ecclesiastical judgments were popularly regarded as the judgments of God.[u] Bishops asserted for themselves an exclusive right to judge all matters relating to the clergy,[x] and, by the superintendence which they exercised over morals, they were able to turn every scandal of the royal house to the advantage of the Church.[y] They became more and more active in politics;[z] they claimed the power of bestowing the crown, and Charles appears to have acknowledged the claim.[a] Yet, although they endeavoured to gain for themselves an exemption from all secular control, that prince still kept a hold on them by means of his *missi*.[b]

The most prominent among the French ecclesiastics was Hincmar, a man of strong, lofty, and resolute character, of a mind at once subtle and eminently practical, of learning which, although uncritical and indifferently digested, raised him above

A.D. 859, c. 14; Conc. Duziac. II. A.D. 874 (Hard. vi. 148-9); Conc. Trecass. II. A.D. 878, c. 3, &c.

[o] Sismondi, iii. 126, 150.

[p] E. g. Conc. Valent. IV. (855), c. 18; Conc. Tull. ad Saponarias (859), vi. 10 (Hard. v. 499).

[q] Gfrörer, Karol. ii. 166-7. Many cathedral and monastic schools, however, continued to flourish. See Hist. Litt. iv. 224, seqq.; Bähr, 39-45.

[r] Hard. v.; Comp. Baron. 842. 3.

[s] See pp. 244-6.

[t] Pertz, Leges, i. 462, c. 3; Guizot, ii. 326.

[u] Planck, iii. 23.

[x] Planck, iii. 22.

[y] Schröckh, xxii. 443; Sismondi, iii. 143.

[z] Sism. 133.

[a] Michelet, ii. 126-7.

[b] E. g. Convent. Sparnac. A.D. 846 (Pertz, Leges, i. 389); Capit. Mersen. A.D. 847 (ib. 394) c. 3; Convent. Silvan. A.D. 853 (ib. 423-6).

almost all his contemporaries, and of great political talent.[c] He was born in 806, of a noble family in Neustria, and at an early age entered the monastery of St. Denys, where he became a monk under Hilduin.[d] He took an active part in restoring the discipline of the house, and to the end of his days he observed the monastic severity of life.[e] His attachment to his abbot was shown by becoming the companion of his exile in 830;[f] but notwithstanding this, and although his own feelings were no doubt in favour of the unity of the empire, he withstood all Hilduin's attempts to draw him into rebellion, and to the last preserved the favour of Louis, by means of which he was able to effect his superior's recall.[g] In 845 he was promoted to the archbishoprick of Rheims, which had not been regularly filled since the deposition of Ebbo, ten years before. He accepted the dignity on condition that the property which had been alienated from it to laymen during the vacancy should be restored,[h] and he held it for thirty-nine years. His province and even his diocese, were partly in Neustria and partly in Lotharingia[i]—a circumstance which brought him into connexion with the sovereigns of both countries. As the successor of St. Remigius, he was the bishop to whom it fell to crown kings, and to take the chief part in state solemnities,[k] and he gave full effect to his position. His political influence was immense; he steadily upheld the cause of the church against both the king and the nobles, and in its behalf often opposed the princes whom he faithfully served.[m] But he was most especially the champion of the national church and of the rights of his sovereign against the growing claims of the papacy.[n]

The popes endeavoured to take advantage of the weakness of Charlemagne's descendants to shake off the golden chains with which the great emperor had bound them. The partition of the

[c] Hist. Litt. v. 587, 590; Planck, iii. 103; Sismondi, iii. 147-8.

[d] Opera, ii. 304.

[e] Schröckh, xx. 20. 25.

[f] Prichard's Life of Hincmar, 97; Littlemore, 1849.

[g] Flodoard, ap. Bouquet, vii. 212; Schröckh, xxiv. 23; Gfrörer, i. 137.

[h] Flodoard, ap. Baron. 845. 39; Prichard, 96-9.

[i] Opera, ii. 310, 694.

[k] Hist. Litt. v. 546; Guizot, ii. 352.

[m] Hist. Litt. v. 588; Guizot, ii. 354-5.

[n] Sismondi says that in his contests with Nicolas I., Hincmar seemed to be restrained by the feeling that his appointment was open to question (iii. 148). But it *was* investigated, and it would appear that he had really nothing to fear in this respect. Rather he was restrained by political considerations. M. Guizot well describes him as a mixture of the logician with the man of business, the second part of his character controlling the other; and points to Bossuet as a parallel (ii. 358-9). M. Ampère, whose estimate of Hincmar is unfavourable, says that in his character "il y a de l'évêque de Meaux *et un peu de l'évêque d'Autun*," iii. 168. The authors of the Histoire Littéraire are also unfavourable to him, chiefly on account of his behaviour to Gottschalck.

empire made an important change in their position, for they were thenceforth in no way subject to any prince except the one who held the imperial title and the kingdom of Italy, while they were yet brought into relation with all the Carolingian sovereigns, and became general arbiters between them.[o]

On the death of Gregory IV. in 844, Sergius II., after some tumultuary opposition from a rival named John,[p] was consecrated without waiting for the imperial confirmation. Lothair, indignant at the slight to his authority, sent his son Louis to call the new pope to account. The prince was accompanied by Drogo, of Metz, with a numerous train of prelates and counts, and was at the head of a large army, which is said, in its advance towards Rome, to have committed much wanton slaughter and devastation, and to have lost many of its soldiers, who, in punishment of their misdeeds, were slain by lightning. Sergius received Louis with the usual honours, but would not permit his troops to enter the city; nor would he allow the doors of St. Peter's to be opened to him, until, in answer to a solemn adjuration, the prince had professed that he came without any evil intention, for the good of Rome and of the Church. The pope crowned Louis as king of the Lombards, but resisted, in his own name and in that of the Roman nobles, a proposal that an oath of allegiance should be taken to him, on the ground that such oaths were due to the emperor alone. He consented, however, that a fresh oath should be taken to the emperor.[q] Drogo returned to France with a commission[r] appointing him primate and papal vicar, with large privileges and jurisdiction; but, on finding that some question was raised as to the reception of this instrument by a synod to which he exhibited it, he refrained from urging his claim.[s]

On the death of Sergius, Leo IV. was chosen by general acclamation. The Romans were in great perplexity; the imminent danger in which they were from the Saracens required them to proceed to an immediate consecration, while they were afraid to repeat their late offence against the Frank empire. They therefore fell on the expedient of consecrating Leo with an express reservation of the imperial rights, and it would seem that this course was allowed to pass without objection.[t] Towards the

A.D. 847.

[o] Planck, iii. 26-8, 31.

[p] Anastas. 227.

[q] Ib. 227-9. Schröckh questions this writer's account of the affair as too favourable to the pope. (xxii. 68.) Luden thinks that Sergius outwitted Louis. vi. 9.

[r] Hard. iv. 1463-6.

[s] Conc. Vern. II. c. 11 (Pertz, Leges, i. 385); Hincmar, ii. 737; De Marca, VI. xxix. 3.

[t] Anastas. 231; Milman, ii. 343. The

end of Leo's pontificate, Lothair, having been informed that a high Roman officer had expressed himself against the Frankish connexion, and had proposed a revolt to the Greeks, went to Rome, and held an inquiry into the case. The librarian Anastasius tells us that the charge was proved to be imaginary, and that the accuser was given up to the accused, from whom the emperor begged him.[u] But the pope was required, probably in consequence of this affair, to promise obedience to the emperor and his missi.[x] A remarkable innovation was introduced by Leo in writing to sovereigns. He set his own name before that of the prince, and omitted the word *Domino* in the address—a change which intimated that St. Peter's successors no longer owned any earthly master.[y]

Benedict III. was elected as the successor of Leo; but he met with a very serious opposition from Anastasius,—probably the same with a cardinal of that name who under the last pontificate had been deposed, chiefly for his attachment to the Franks.[z] Anastasius got possession of St. Peter's and of St. John Lateran, and (perhaps in the hope of recommending himself to the Franks, although these were no iconoclasts) he is said to have broken and burnt the images which adorned the churches.[a] He was aided by Frankish soldiers, and gained over the envoys who were sent to ask the imperial confirmation of his rival's election; he stripped Benedict of his robes, insulted him, and beat him. But the clergy and people of Rome adhered to Benedict, and their demonstrations prevailed on the emperor's commissioners to sanction his consecration.[b]

Benedict was succeeded by Nicolas I., who, according to a contemporary annalist, owed his elevation rather to the presence and

misstatements of Baronius as to this are exposed by Pagi, xiv. 348, seqq.

[u] Anast. 246. Gfrörer thinks that Anastasius does not tell the truth, and that there was a real conspiracy. i. 287.

[x] Gieseler, II. i. 49.

[y] Gieseler, II. i. 48. The fabulous female pope, Joan, is inserted between Leo and Benedict. Had such a story been known at Rome in the middle of the eleventh century, Leo IX. would not have ventured, in writing to the patriarch of Constantinople, to mention a rumour that the Byzantine church "eunuchos passim promovendo fœminam in sede pontificum suorum sublimasset aliquando." (Hard. vi. 940.) The first writers, unsuspected of forgery or interpolation, in whom it is found, are Stephen de Borbone and Mart. Polonus —both of the 13th century. Its origin is still matter of question, but is most commonly referred to the degradation of the papacy under female influence, which followed soon after this time. See Baron. 853. 56-69; Pagi, xiv. 424; Schröckh, xxii. 75-110; Bayle, art. "Papesse" and "Polonus;" Gibbon, iv. 512-3; Gieseler, II. i. 29-32; Luden is inclined to favour the tale (vi. 513-7). Gfrörer very confidently proposes some wild conjectures on the subject, i. 289.

[z] Anast. 244; Baron. 853. 3, 5; Gfrörer, i. 288.

[a] Anast. 247-8; Gfrörer, i. 293-4.

[b] Anastas. 249; Milman, ii. 314.

favour of Louis II., Lothair's successor in the empire, than to the choice of the Roman clergy.[c] At his consecration was introduced the new ceremony of coronation—a ceremony which probably referred to the pretended donation of Constantine,[d] and which was intended to assert for the pope the majesty of an earthly sovereign, in addition to that higher and more venerable dignity which claimed not only precedence but control over all earthly power.[e] And when, soon after, Nicolas visited the camp of Louis, the emperor did him honour by holding his reins, and by walking at his side as he rode.[f] Nicolas was one of those popes who stand forth in history as the chief agents in the advancement of their see. The idea entertained of him shortly after his death is remarkably expressed by Regino, of Prüm, who speaks of him as surpassing all his predecessors since the great Gregory; as giving commands to kings and tyrants, and ruling over them as if lord of the whole world; as full of meekness and gentleness in his dealings with bishops and clergy who were worthy of their calling, but terrible and austere towards the careless and the refractory; as another Elias "in spirit and in power."[g] He was learned, skilful in the management of affairs, sincerely zealous for discipline, filled with a sense of the importance of his position, ambitious, active, and resolute in maintaining and advancing it. He took advantage of the faults or vices of the Frank princes—their ambition, their lust, or their hatred—to interpose in their affairs, and with great ability he played them against each other. His interposition was in the interest of justice, or in the defence of weakness; it was backed by the approbation of the great body of the people, who learnt to see in him the representative of heaven, ready everywhere to assert the right, and able to restrain the wicked who were above the reach of earthly law.[h] And doubtless he was able to conceal from himself all but what was good in his motives. But those of his acts which in themselves were praiseworthy, were yet parts of a system which in other cases appeared without any such creditable veil—a scheme of vast ambition for rendering all secular power subject to the church, and all national churches subject to Rome.[i]

A.D. 858.

[c] Prudentius Trecass. (i. e. bishop of Troyes), in Pertz, i. 452.

[d] See p. 175.

[e] Anastas. 253; Schröckh, xxii. 112.

[f] Anast. 253.

[g] Regin. Ann. 868 (Pertz, i. 579).

[h] Gieseler, II. i. 196; Gfrörer, i. 297-8.

[i] One of this pope's smaller triumphs may be mentioned in a note. John, archbishop of Ravenna—a see which had often before given trouble to the popes—set up high pretensions to independence. But he was disappointed in

Of the controversies or disputes of this time—which must be treated severally, since it is a less evil to sacrifice the display of their correspondence in time, than for its sake to throw the narrative into hopeless confusion—two related to important points of doctrine—the Eucharistic Presence, and Predestination.

I. We have already seen that, with respect to the Eucharist, there had been a gradual increase of mystical language; and that expressions were at first used rhetorically and in a figurative sense which, if literally construed, would have given an incorrect idea of the current doctrine.[k] In the west the authority of St. Augustine had generally acted as a safeguard against materialising views of the Eucharistic presence;[m] but an important step toward he establishment of such views was now made by Paschasius Radbert, abbot of Corbie. Paschasius had been brought up in that monastery under Adelhard and Wala, and became their biographer. He had been master of the monastic school, and had laboured as a commentator on the Scriptures. In 844, he was elected abbot; but the disquietudes to which the dignity exposed him, induced him to resign it in 851, and he lived as a private monk until his death in 865.[n]

In 831, Paschasius, at the request of his old pupil Warin, who had become abbot of the daughter monastery of New Corbey, in Saxony, drew up a treatise on the Eucharist for the instruction of the younger monks of that society.[o] Soon after his appointment to the abbacy of his own house, in 844, he presented an improved edition of the work to Charles the Bald, who had requested a copy of it. In this,[p] the rhetoric of earlier writers is turned into unequivocally material definitions. Paschasius lays it down, that, although, after the consecration, the appearance of bread and wine remain, yet we must not believe anything else to be really present than the body and blood of the Saviour—the same flesh which was

his hopes of support from Louis II., and, being excommunicated by Nicolas, he was reduced to a very abject state. In order to obtain absolution, he bound himself to repair to Rome once a-year, and submitted to a limitation of his power over his own suffragans, whom he was not to consecrate without the pope's permission. (A.D. 861-2.) Anastas. 254-6; Baron. 861. 57-64; Milman, ii. 358-9.

[k] i. 515; ii. 212.

[m] Ebrard, i. 309, seqq.; Giesecler, I. ii. 117. Villiers, the editor of Fulbert's works, finding in them a quotation where it is said that our Lord's words as to eating His body are a *figure*, interpolated "dicet hæreticus;" but, being informed that the quotation was from St. Augustine, he coolly put his own insertion into the table of errata. Schröckh, xxiii. 506.

[n] Hist. Litt. v. 289; Pagi, xiv. 390.

[o] Pagi, xiv. 173; Mabil. VI. viii.-x.

[p] 'De Corp. et Sanguine Domini' (in Bibl. Patr. Lugd. xiv.)

born of the Blessed Virgin—the same in which He suffered on the cross and rose from the grave.[q] This doctrine is rested on the almighty power of God; the miracles of Scripture are said to have been wrought in order to prepare the way for it and to confirm it; that the elements remain unchanged in appearance and in taste, is intended as an exercise of our faith.[r] The miraculous production of the Saviour's body is paralleled with His conception as man.[s] Tales are adduced of miracles by which the reality hidden under the appearance of the elements was visibly revealed.[t] The doctrine afterwards known as Transubstantiation appears to be broadly expressed; but, contrary to the later practice of Rome, Paschasius insists on the necessity of receiving the cup as well as the eucharistic bread.[u]

Paschasius had professed to lay down his doctrine as that established in the church; but protests were immediately raised against it.[x] Raban Maur, Walafrid Strabo, and Christian Druthmar,[y] all of them among the most learned men of the age, objected to the idea of any other than a spiritual change in the Eucharist, and denounced it as a novelty.[z] Frudegard, a monk of Corbie, expressed uneasiness on account of his abbot's apparent contradiction to the spiritual doctrine of St. Augustine; and Paschasius, in a letter to him, endeavoured to support it by the authority of earlier writers, among whom he especially relied on St. Ambrose.[a]

[q] Cc. i. x. It seems to be chiefly in thus maintaining the *identity* of the body, that Paschasius goes beyond John of Damascus. See p. 213; Joh. Dam. de Fid. Orthod. iv. 13 (t. i. 169); and Dupin, vii. 65. Mabillon (VI. Præf. xxiv.-xxxii.) attempts to show that it was only at the expression of this idea that the contemporaries of Paschasius were offended, and argues very unsuccessfully that there was ancient authority for it.

[r] C. i.

[s] C. iv.

[t] C. xiv.

[u] C. xix. On the slight differences between the doctrine of Paschasius and that afterwards sanctioned, see Basnage, 910. Bishop Cosin, after having, in the draft of his work on Transubstantiation, given the usual view of Paschasius's opinions, maintained in the treatise when published, that he did *not* teach transubstantiation (Works, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib. iv. 79-81); and in our own day Ebrard has maintained that he taught only a *spiritual* presence, by *power* or *virtual effect* (i. 410-2). But the very chapter in which the word *potentialiter* occurs (c. iv.) goes on to language and illustrations which seem clearly to show that the representation usually given of the writer, both by friends and by opponents, is correct. To the same purpose are the stories of miracles (c. xiv.), which Bishop Cosin is obliged to dispose of by supposing them interpolated (p. 81). The utmost that Professor Ebrard appears to establish is an *inconsistency* in the doctrine of Paschasius. (411-6.)

[x] This fact is enough to disprove the argument of Mabillon (VI. xv.) and of Pagi (xiv. 173), that so learned a man could not have mistaken the Church's doctrine.

[y] Druthmar was distinguished as a commentator, who, contrary to the usual practice of his time, followed the literal and historical explanation of Scripture. Schröckh, xxiii. 269; Hist. Litt. v.

[z] Gieseler, II. i. 120-4.

[a] Bibl. Patrum, xiv. 754, seqq.

But the chief opponent of the doctrine was another monk of Corbie, Ratramn, who examined the abbot's book at the request of Charles the Bald,[c] and answered it, although, in consideration of his relation to Paschasius, he did not name the author. Ratramn divides the question into two heads: (1) Whether the body and blood of Christ be present in figure or in truth; and, (2) whether it be the same body which was born of the Virgin, which suffered, rose again, and ascended. He defines *figure* to mean that the reality is veiled under something else, as where our Lord styles himself a vine; and *truth* to mean, that the reality is openly displayed. Although, he says, the elements remain outwardly the same as before consecration, the body and blood of Christ are presented in them, not to the bodily senses, but to the faithful soul.[d] And this must be in a figurative way; for otherwise there would be nothing for faith, "the evidence of things not seen," to work on; the sacrament would not be a mystery, since in order to a mystery there must be something beyond what is seen.[e] The change is not material, but spiritual;[f] the elements, while in one respect they continue bread and wine, are in another respect, by spirit and potency, the body and blood of Christ,[g] even as the element of water is endued with a spiritual power in order to the sacrament of baptism.[h] That which is visible and corruptible feeds the body; that which is believed is itself immortal, it sanctifies the soul and feeds it unto everlasting life.[i] The body of Christ must be incorruptible; therefore that which is corruptible in the sacrament is but the figure of the reality.[k] Ratramn clears the interpretation of these passages which had been quoted from St. Ambrose in favour of the opposite view.[m] He quotes St. Augustine and St. Isidore of Seville as agreeing in his own doctrine,[n] and he argues from the Liturgy, that the Saviour's presence must be spiritual and figurative, since the sacrament is there spoken of as a *pledge*, an *image*, and a *likeness*.[o]

[b] Ratramn. de Corp. et Sang. Domini. Oxon. 1838, c. i.

[c] Neander, vi. 214.

[d] Cc. 9-10. [e] C. 11.

[f] C. 12. [g] Cc. 13-6.

[h] Cc. 17-18. [i] Cc. 19, 49.

[k] Cc. 86-7. [m] Cc. 51-69.

[n] Cc. 33-6, 41-5, 77-8, 93-6.

[o] Cc. 84-6. Ratramn's book was first published in 1532, and in that and other editions he is called *Bertram*. Some Romanists declared it to be a forgery of the Reformers, and it was classed by the Council of Trent among forbidden books. Some divines of Louvain and Douay afterwards tried to show that it was tolerable; but the use made of it by the reformed stood in the way of this opinion. Mabillon (VI. I. seqq.), the authors of the Hist. Littéraire (iv. 260; v. 397), and others, have attempted to show that it is identical in doctrine with that of Paschasius — an opinion which the Abbé Rohrbacher maintains with his usual modesty and good sense (xii. 85-7). See Mosheim, ii. 233; Schröckh, xxiii. 479. It is excluded from the Lyons Bibliotheca (t. xv.),

John Scotus, who will be more particularly mentioned hereafter, is said to have also written on the question, at the desire of Charles the Bald, but if so, his book is lost. His other works contain grounds for thinking that he regarded the Eucharist as a merely commemorative rite, and that on this, as on other points, he was regarded as heterodox.[p] While the most learned divines of the age in general opposed Paschasius, his doctrine appears to have been supported by the important authority of Hincmar,[q] although it is doubtful whether the archbishop really meant to assert it in its full extent, or is to be understood as speaking rhetorically. The controversy lasted for some time; but the doctrine of Paschasius, which was recommended by its appearance of piety, and by its agreement with the prevailing love of the miraculous, gained the ascendancy within the following century.[r]

II. Throughout the west St. Augustine was revered as the greatest of all the ancient fathers, and the chief teacher of orthodoxy; yet his system was not in general thoroughly held. The councils which had been assembled on account of the Pelagian doctrines had occupied themselves with the subject of Grace, and had not given any judgment as to Predestination; and the followers of Augustine had endeavoured to mitigate the asperities of his tenets on this question. The prevailing doctrine was of a milder tone; in many cases it was not far from Semipelagianism,[s] and, even where it could not be so described, it fell so far short of the rigid Augustinianism that a theologian who strictly adhered to this might have fairly charged his brethren with unfaithfulness to the teaching of the great African father.[t]

Gottschalck[u] was the son of a Saxon Count, by whom he was in

where other works of Ratramn are given, on the pretext that it had been corrupted by heretics. Amid these conflicting views, the English Church may well claim it, since Bishop Ridley was converted by it from a belief in transubstantiation, and it served as a model for the doctrine of our Reformation. (Ridley, ed. Park. Soc. 159.)

[p] Mabillon, vi. Præf. lxiv.; Schröckh, xxiv. 482; Neander, vi. 217-8. It appears that the early quotations which profess to be from Scotus on the Eucharist are really from Ratramn's book, and that writers who speak of a book by the one do not name the other; and to this Gieseler would trace the notion of Scotus having written on the subject (II. i. 123-4). But, as Neander observes (vi. 217-8), the confusion between the books is hardly enough to warrant us in supposing that Scotus did not write at all. De Marca had supposed Ratramn's book to be really the work of Scotus, but was confuted by Mabillon, VI. xliv.-vii. See Dupin, vii. 67-8; Bähr, 474. Gieseler's opinion has been supported by Laufs; against it see Gfrörer, Kirchengesch. iii. 921-2.

[q] Hincm. ii. 99-100.

[r] Schröckh, xxiii. 487-8; Gieseler, II. i. 126-7.

[s] See vol. i. p. 489.

[t] Schröckh, xxiv. 119-121; Neander, vi. 178; Gieseler, II. i. 128.

[u] *Schalck*, in old German, signified a *servant*, although its meaning has undergone the same change as that of our

boyhood placed in the monastery of Fulda. But on attaining to man's estate, he felt a strong distaste for the life of a monk, and in 829 he applied for a release from his vows to a synod held at Mentz under Archbishop Otgar. He represented that he had been devoted to the monastic profession before he could exercise any will of his own; and on this ground the synod granted his petition. But the abbot of Fulda, Raban Maur, the pupil of Alcuin and himself the greatest teacher of his time,[v] appealed to Louis the Pious, arguing that persons offered by their parents, although without their own choice, were bound by the monastic obligations; and the emperor overruled the synod's decision.[x]

Although compelled to remain a monk, Gottschalck was allowed to remove from Fulda, where his relation to Raban would have been inconvenient, to Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons. Here he gave himself up to the study of Augustine and his followers; he embraced their peculiarities with enthusiasm, and such was his especial love for the works of Fulgentius that his friends usually called him by the name of that writer.[y] It is a characteristic circumstance that one of the most eminent of his friends, Servatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, in a letter of this period, charges him with an immoderate fondness for speculation, and exhorts him to turn from it to matters of a more practical kind.[z] Hincmar, on the report of the abbot of Orbais, describes him while there as restless, changeable, bent on preversities, addicted to argument, and apt to misrepresent what was said by others in conversation with him; as scorning to be a disciple of the truth, and preferring to be a master of error; as eager to gain an influence, by correspondence and otherwise, over persons who were inclined to novelty and desirous of notoriety at any price.[a] With a view, no doubt, to the opportunity of preaching his doctrines, he obtained ordination as a

own word *knave*. *Gottschalck*, therefore, = *servant of God*. Ussher, Hist. Gottescalci, Dubl. 1631, p. 14.

[v] Neander, vi. 156. He was, perhaps, born in 786, and he died in 856 (Kunstmann, 'Hrabanus Magnentius Maurus,' 14, 159, Mainz, 1844). The name of Maurus was given to him by Alcuin in remembrance of St. Maur, the disciple of St. Benedict. Ib. 37; Mabillon, vi. 20.

[x] Schröckh, xxiv. 5-6; Kunstmann, 70. Gottschalck's claim might seem to have been countenanced by the Council of Mentz, in 813, c. 23, which is against compelling persons to be monks or clergy; but Mabillon argues (VI. cvi.) that it did not intend to forbid the oblation of boys. The rule of Cluny afterwards ordered that the benediction of boys should not take place under the age of fifteen; and in this, other orders, popes, and at length the Council of Trent, agreed. Ib. cvi.-cvii.

[y] He is so styled by Walafrid Strabo, in a poem which Ussher gives, p. 38.

[z] Serv. Lup. Ep. xxx. (Bibl. Patr. xv. 15-6).

[a] Hincm. De Prædest. c. 2 (Opera, i. 20); Ep. ad Nicol. Pap. t. ii. 262; ii. 264, 295.

U

priest from a chorepiscopus of Rheims, during the vacancy of that see after the deposition of Ebbo. This act appears to have been a token of disaffection to the episcopal body, with which the chorepiscopi were then on very unfriendly terms;[b] it was censured as irregular, inasmuch as Gottschalck belonged to the diocese of Soissons, and as the chorepiscopus had no authority from any superior to confer the priestly ordination at all.[c]

The doctrine on which Gottschalck especially took his stand was that of Predestination. The usual language in the church had been, that the righteous are *predestinate*, and that the wicked are *foreknown*, while the rigid Augustinianism spoke of the wicked as *reprobate*;[d] but Gottschalck applied the term *predestinate* to both classes.[e] There is, he said, a *twofold* predestination—a term for which he cited the authority of Isidore of Seville.[f] In both cases predestination is to *good*; but good is twofold, including not only the benefits of grace but the judgments of justice. As life is predestined to the good, and they to it, so evil is predestined to the wicked, and they to it.[g] His opponents usually charged him with maintaining that the wicked were irresistibly and irrevocably doomed to sin, as well as to its consequences. But it would seem, even by Hincmar's own avowal,[h] that Gottschalck did not admit this representation of his opinions; he maintained only that, as the perseverance in evil of the devil, his angels, and wicked men was foreknown, they were predestinated to righteous punishment.[i] He denied that Christ died for any but the elect, and explained the texts which speak of God's willing all men to be saved as applicable to those only who actually *are* saved. And, unlike Augustine, he held that even the first human pair were subject to a predestination.[k] The view which his adversaries took of his opinion may be in some degree excused by the violence with which he insisted on his difference from them, and by his zeal in condemning them—circumstances which could not but lead them to suppose the difference far greater than it appears to have really been.

Gottschalck was returning from a visit to Rome, in 847, when at the house of Eberhard, count of Friuli, a son-in-law of Louis the

[b] See p. 183.
[c] Hincm. i. 21; ii. 262.
[d] Neander, vi. 180-2.
[e] Confessio prolixior, ap. Usser, 215-7.
[f] Conf. brevior, ib. 212. Cf. Hincm. de Præd. c. 9, p. 33.
[g] Conf. prolix. 214.
[h] De Præd. c. 15, p. 63, where he treats Gottschalck's distinction as only nominal "cum non nisi per peccatum perveniri valeat ad interitum." See Kunstm. 135.
[i] Conf. brev. 211; Conf. prolix. 219, 222; Usser, 44; Gieseler, II. i. 129.
[k] Schröckh, xxiv. 16-7; Neander, vi. 182.

Pious,[m] he met Notting, who had been lately nominated to the see of Verona. He propounded his doctrine of twofold predestination, at which Notting was greatly startled. The bishop soon after mentioned it to Raban Maur, whom he met at the court of Louis of Germany, and Raban, who had lately become archbishop of Mentz, wrote both to Notting and to Eberhard, in strong condemnation of Gottschalek's opinion, which he declared to be no doctrine of St. Augustine. Predestination, he said, could only be a preparation for grace; God foreknows evil, but does not predestinate to it; all who yield their corrupt will to the guidance of Divine grace may be saved.[n] Count Eberhard, on receiving the archbishop's letter, dismissed his dangerous visitor.[o] Gottschalek travelled slowly homeward through Southern Germany; and it would seem to have been from his proceedings in these already Christian lands that Hincmar speaks of him as having visited the most distant nations for the purpose of infecting them with his errors.[p] In 848 he appeared before a synod held by Raban at Mentz in the presence of king Louis. His attendance was probably voluntary, and he carried with him an answer to Raban's objections, as if prepared for a disputation.[q] He charged the archbishop with following the heresy of Gennadius and Cassian, and reasserted the doctrine of a double predestination. His opinions were condemned; he was obliged to swear that he would never again enter the dominions of Louis;[r] and he was sent to his own metropolitan, Hincmar, with a letter in which he was styled a vagabond,[s] and it was recommended that, as being incorrigible, he should be confined.[t]

In the following year, Hincmar brought Gottschalek before a synod at Kiersy[u] on the Oise, where, according to the archbishop, he behaved like a possessed person, and, instead of answering questions, broke out into personal attacks. He was flogged severely, in the presence of King Charles,—a punishment for which the rule of St. Benedict and the canons of Agde were quoted as a warrant, not without some straining of their application.[x] A.D. 849.

[m] Hist. Litt. v. 446.

[n] Schröckh, xxiv. 11-3; Kunstm. 120, seqq. The letters are in Sirmond's Opuscula, t. iii. Paris, 1675.

[o] Kunstm. 127.

[p] Hincm. ii. 262.

[q] Schröckh, xxiv. 13-5; Gfrörer, i. 214-5. From the words in the Annales Bertiniani — "episcopali concilio *detectus*"—Kunstmann (wrongly, as it appears to me) imagines that he was dragged from a hiding-place.

[r] Annal. Fuld. 848 (Pertz, i. 365).

[s] "Gyrovagus." He would seem to have left Orbais without leave from the abbot. Kunstm. 120, 132.

[t] The letter is in Ussher, p. 46, and in Hardouin, v. 15. Comp. Schröckh, xxiv. 15-9.

[u] Hard. v. 17.

[x] Hincm. i. 21, 443. See Schröckh, xxiv. 40.

When exhausted with this cruel usage, he was required to throw his book into the fire, and had hardly strength enough to do so.[y] Hincmar long after told pope Nicolas that he had been obliged to take the matter into his own hands because the bishop of Soissons, Rothad, was himself infected with novelties;[z] and for the same reason Gottschalck, who was condemned by the synod to perpetual silence, was removed to the monastery of Hautvilliers, within the diocese of Rheims.

His zeal was rather quickened than daunted by his imprisonment. He refused to subscribe a declaration sent to him by Hincmar, which would have had the effect of releasing him on condition of his admitting that there might be Divine foresight without predestination.[a] He denounced the opposite party under the name of *Rabanists*;[b] and in one of two confessions which he sent forth,[c] he speaks of them as heretics whom it was his bounden duty to avoid.[d] In these confessions he lays down his doctrine of a twofold predestination—of good angels and men, freely, to bliss; of the evil to punishment, justly, on foreknowledge of their guilt. In the larger of the two, which (probably in imitation of St. Augustine) bears the form of an address to God, he breaks out into a prayer that an opportunity might be granted him of testifying the truth of his opinions, in the presence of the king, of bishops, clergy, monks, and laity, by plunging successively into four casks of boiling water, oil, fat, and pitch; and lastly by walking through a blazing pile.[e] This wish has been variously traced to humility and to hypocrisy[f]—qualities which seem to have been alike foreign to Gottschalck's character. It would accord better with the rest of his history, if we were to seek the motive in a proud and self-important but sincere fanaticism.

The doctrines for which Gottschalck was suffering now found important champions, although these varied somewhat among themselves, while all (like Gottschalck himself) disavowed the opinion of an irresistible predestination to sin.[g] Among them were—Prudentius, a Spaniard by birth, bishop of Troyes;[h] Ser-

[y] Eccl. Lugd. ap. Usser, 62.

[z] Hincm. ii. 262.

[a] Gieseler, II. i. 130, from Flodoard. Comp. Schröckh, xxiv. 43.

[b] Amulo ad Gottesch. (ap. Agobard. ii. 169).

[c] They were first published at the end of Archbp. Ussher's work.

[d] Conf. prolix. p. 232.

[e] "Oleo, pingui" (p. 233). These words are usually printed without a comma between them, as if *pingui* were an epithet. But it must be taken as a substantive, in order to make up the number of barrels.

[f] See Schröckh, xxiv. 48.

[g] Most of their works are in Bibl. Patr. Lugd. xv.

[h] Prudentius wrote part of the 'Annales Bertiniani,' which were continued by Hincmar. Hincmar, in the opening of his part, says that his predecessor,

vatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, an old pupil of Raban, who had great weight in the French church, and was highly esteemed by Charles the Bald;[k] and Ratramn, who in this controversy, as in that on the Eucharistic Presence, wrote at the king's request and for his information.[m] Hincmar found it necessary to seek for assistance against these writers. Raban, to whom he applied, excused himself, chiefly on the plea of age and infirmity, and added that in many points he agreed with Gottschalck, although he thought him mistaken as to the predestination of the wicked.[n] But Hincmar found allies in Amalarius, an ecclesiastic of Metz, who was distinguished as a ritualist,[o] and in Amulo, archbishop of Lyons, the pupil and successor of Agobard.[p]

The most remarkable work in opposition to Gottschalck's views, however, was that of John Scotus. The circumstance of this celebrated man's life are enveloped in much obscurity. The name *Scotus*, like that of *Erigena*, which was given to him at a later time, indicates that he was of Irish birth. From his knowledge of Greek it has been supposed that he had travelled in the east; yet Greek was an ordinary branch of education in his native country and in Britain. That he was acquainted with Hebrew has often been said, but without sufficient proof.[q] Like the other learned men of his time, John appears to have belonged to some order of the clergy.[r] He had for some years found a home in the court of Charles the Bald, and had restored the reputation of the Palace school,[s] which had sunk during the distractions of the preceding reign;[t] and among other literary labours, he had translated the pretended works of Dionysius the Areopagite, which had been sent as a present by the Greek emperor Michael to Louis the Pious.[u] Scotus had a far greater affinity with the ancient

after having opposed Gottschalck, took up his cause out of private enmity to some bishops. Pertz, i. 465.

[k] Hist. Litt. v. 256-7; Schröckh, xxiv. 56, seqq.

[m] Ib. 50-1.

[n] Raban. ad Hincm. ap. Sirmond., Opusc. iii. Paris, 1675. Gfrörer (altogether improbably and unjustly, as it seems to me) supposes that Raban lent himself to Louis of Germany's dislike of Hincmar, by first drawing him into controversy and then deserting him! (i. 262-3.)

[o] Some, however, have supposed this Amalarius to have been a different person from the ritualist. See Hist. Litt. iv. 535.

[p] Amulo, Ep. ad Gottesch., in Agobard's works, ii.

[q] Ritter, vii. 206-7.

[r] This has been denied; but Ritter (vii. 207) refers to Staudenmaier as having proved it.

[s] See p. 134.

[t] Guizot, ii. 371.

[u] It was not, as has been commonly said, the embassy on the question of images, but a later one, in 827, that conveyed this present. (Pagi, xiii. 134.) Louis, after his reconciliation with the church at St. Denys, in 836, desired Hilduin to collect materials for the life of the Areopagite, who from that time was identified with the patron of the monastery and of France. (Bouquet, vi.

philosophers—especially the Neoplatonists—than with the theologians of his own age. His bold and rationalising mind plunged into questionable, or evidently heretical, speculations; there are passages in his works which indicate an almost undisguised pantheism.[x] Of his latter years nothing is known. It has been supposed that he went into England, and aided the great Alfred in his labours for the education of his people; but this opinion is traced to a confusion between him and a learned Saxon monk named John, and it is more probable that he ended his days in France.[y]

The controversy thus far had differed from those of the earlier ages in appealing exclusively to authority. Augustine and the other fathers had exercised their original thought in the definition of doctrine; but hitherto the question as to predestination did not relate to the truth of Christian doctrine, but to the manner in which that doctrine had been determined by St. Augustine.[z] Scotus took a new line.[a] Like the theologians who had preceded him, he professed to appeal to Scripture and the fathers; but both Scripture and fathers (he said) had condescended to the weakness of their readers, and much of their language was to be figuratively understood. Thus a principle was laid down by which their most positive expressions might be set aside, and anything which seemed to disagree with the philosopher's own speculations might be explained away.[b]

Scotus wrote at the request of Hincmar, and inscribed his book to him and to his associate[c] in the cause, Pardulus, bishop of

347-8; Baron. 824. 30; 834. 4, seqq.; Fleury, xlvii. 50; Neander, vi. 170.) Hilduin is not, however, to be regarded as the author of this opinion, but only as having given it establishment and popularity, since traces of it are found in the preceding century, and it is indeed implied in the employment of the abbot of St. Denys as the biographer of the Areopagite. See Hist. Litt. iv. 611-2; Gieseler, II. i. 162-4.

[x] See Guizot, ii. 383-7; Neander, vi. 163-9; Ritter, vii. 235; Ampère, iii. 137-141.

[y] Gieseler, II. i. 86-7. Scotus has been identified with John of Old Saxony by Baronius (878. 62); Fuller (i. 180-2); Spelman and his editor Hearne (Life of Alfred, 133-5); Collier (i. 388-390). Against the identity, see Pagi, xv. 337; Hist. Litt. v. 419; Lingard, A. S. C. ii. 246; Murdock, n. in Mosheim, ii. 213; Hallam, Supplem. Notes, 391; Lanigan, iii. 301; Hardy, n. on W. Malmesb. 188; Gfrörer, iii. 938. Bähr, while he distinguishes the two, thinks it likely that Scotus, finding his position uneasy, may have left France and have repaired to Alfred's court (485). Mr. Soames, in that anti-historical spirit against which I have often felt it necessary to protest, denounces the distinction between the Johns as an attempt in the Roman interest to clear Alfred from the charge of having patronised an opponent of Transubstantiation! Ni in Mosheim, loc. cit.

[z] Guizot, ii. 361, 369.

[a] 'De Divina Prædestinatione Liber.' Joh. Scoti Opera, 355-440, ed. Floss, Paris, 1853. (vol. 122 of Migne's 'Patrologia.')

[b] Hist. Litt. v. 420-1; Ritter, vii. 212-5.

[c] De Div. Præd. Præf.

Laon. He set out with a parade of philosophical method, and declared that true philosophy and true theology are identical.[d] He treats Gottschalck as a heretic. It is, he says, an impropriety to speak of *pre*destination or *fore*knowledge in God, since to Him all time is present; but, admitting the use of such words, he holds that predestination is eternal, and is as much a part of God Himself as any other of His attributes.[e] It can, therefore, only be *one*; we can no more suppose two predestinations in God than two wisdoms or two knowledges.[f] He disallows Gottschalck's distinction of one *twofold* predestination; the Divine predestination must be truly one, and must be to good only.[g] He strongly maintains the freedom of the will to choose not only evil (to which Lupus had limited it),[h] but good; free-will (he says) is a good gift of God, although it may be employed for evil.[i] Predestination and foreknowledge in God are one, and relate only to good; for God can only foresee that which has a being, whereas sin and punishment are not.[k] Sin is, as Augustine had taught, only the defect of righteousness; punishment is but the defect of bliss.[m] If the soul has the capacity for blessedness, the longing for bliss without the power of attaining it is the keenest possible torment; thus the true punishment is that which sin inflicts on itself.[n] The fire (whether it be corporeal, as Augustine thinks, or incorporeal, according to Gregory) is not needed for the punishment of the wicked, but for the balance and completeness of the universe. It is in itself good; the blessed will dwell in it as well as the wicked, and it will affect each kind according to their capacities, even as light produces different effects on sound and on ailing eyes.[o] "Forasmuch as there is no bliss but eternal life, and life eternal is the knowledge of the truth, therefore there is no other bliss than the knowledge of the truth. . . . So, if there be no misery but eternal death, and eternal death is the ignorance of the truth, there is consequently no misery except ignorance of the truth."[p]

If Hincmar, in inviting Scotus to take part in the controversy, aimed at counteracting the influence of Lupus and Ratramn over Charles the Bald, he was in so far successful, for from that time the king was steadily on his side.[q] But in other respects he found

[d] C. 1; Ritter, vii. 211.
[e] C. ix. 1.
[f] C. ii. 6.
[g] Cc. iii. 6; iv.
[h] Lup. Ep. 128 (Bibl. Patr. xv. 42, e); De tribus Quæstionibus, ib. 45, f.
[i] Cc. iv. 4; vi. 1; vii. 1; viii. 7-9.
[k] Cc. x. 3; xi.-xii.
[m] C. x. 5.
[n] C. xvi.
[o] C. xvii. 8-9; xix.
[p] C. xvii. 9.
[q] Guizot, ii. 376; Gfrörer, i. 231.

the philosopher a very dangerous and embarrassing ally, so that he even felt himself obliged to disavow him.[r]

The excitement raised by the novelties of Scotus was very great. Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, whom Hincmar had studiously, and hitherto successfully, endeavoured to conciliate,[s] now sent a number of propositions, extracted from the book, to Prudentius, with a request that he would examine, and, if necessary, refute them.[t] The bishop of Troyes thereupon wrote against Scotus with great asperity, and he was followed by Florus, a deacon and master of the cathedral school at Lyons.[u] These writers charge Scotus with Pelagianism, to which Prudentius adds Origenism and Collyridianism.[x] They complain of him for imputing imaginary errors to his opponents; they censure him for substituting philosophy for theology, and sophistical subtleties for arguments from Scripture and ancient authorities. Hincmar and Pardulus entreated Amulo to assist them, but he died in 852, and his see was filled by Remigius, who wrote on the opposite side, taking up the case of Gottschalck more expressly than those who had preceded him, and defending the impugned opinions, with the exception of that which limited the exercise of free-will since the fall to the choice of evil.[y]

Finding that the literary contest was against him, Hincmar resolved to fortify himself with the authority of a council, and at Kiersy, in 853, four decrees on the subject of the controversy were passed.[z] It is laid down that man fell by the abuse of his free will; that God, by his foreknowledge, chose some whom by his grace He predestinated to life, and life to them: but as for those whom He, by righteous judgment, left in their lost estate, He did not predestine them to perish, but predestined punishment to their sin. "And hereby," it is said, "we speak of only one predestination of God, which relates either to the gift of grace or to the retribution of justice."[a] It is defined that our free will was lost by the fall, but was recovered through Christ; that we have a free will to good, prevented and aided by grace, and a free will to evil, deserted by grace;[b] that God would have all

[r] Hincm. de Prædest. c. 31, p. 232.
[s] Gfrörer, i. 217, 232.
[t] Usser. 115-125.
[u] Hist. Litt. v. 214. Florus is in Ussher, 126, seqq.
[x] Prud. ap. Usser. 163. See Pagi, xiv. 400.
[y] He questioned whether Gottschalck held this, Ep. Gul. Lugd. ap. Usser. 64. Schröckh, xxiv. 90; Gieseler, II. i. 134.
[z] Sirmond, followed by Ussher (c. vi.) and others, wrongly refers these to the council of the same place in 849. Gieseler, II. i. 134.
[a] C. 1. [b] C. 2.

men to be saved, and that Christ suffered for all; and that the ruin of those who perish is to be ascribed to their own desert.[c]

Prudentius, who was present when these decrees were passed, subscribed them, but he afterwards put forth four propositions against them.[d] Remigius, who was a subject of Lothair, wrote, in the name of his Church, against the articles of Kiersy.[e] His tone was very disrespectful towards Hincmar. Of Scotus he said that he was ignorant of the very words of Scripture, and that, instead of being consulted on points of faith, he ought either to be pitied as a man out of his right mind, or to be anathematised as a heretic.[f] Remigius, however, maintained the necessity of free will, in order to responsibility.[g] Against the authority of the council of Kiersy was set one which met in 855 at Valence, in Lotharingia.[h] This assembly condemned nineteen propositions extracted from Scotus, which, by a phrase borrowed from St. Jerome's attack on Cœlestius, it characterised as "porridge of the Scots."[i] It laid down moderate definitions as to free will and the extent of the Redeemer's death.[k] But it censured the four articles of Kiersy as useless, or even noxious and erroneous; and it forbade, in the name of the Holy Spirit, any teaching contrary to its own.[m] The decrees of Valence were confirmed by a council held near Langres in 859,[n] although, at the instance of Remigius, the offensive expressions against the articles of Kiersy were omitted.[o] A greater council, to which that of Langres was preliminary, met a fortnight later at Savonnières, a suburb of Toul. Here again the subject was entertained; Remigius acted in a spirit of conciliation, and the decision was adjourned to a future synod.[p]

In the meantime Gottschalck was not inactive in his seclusion. Hincmar had altered an ancient hymn of unknown authorship,[q] in which the application of the word *trine* to the Godhead seemed to suggest a threefold difference in the Divine nature.[r] Rabau

[c] Cc. 3-4; Hard. v. 18-20.

[d] Prud. Ep. ad Guenilon. (Usser. 166-8); Gfrörer, i. 241-4.

[e] The authorship of the letter has, however, been questioned. See Schröckh, xxiv. 98.

[f] Eccl. Lugd. ap. Usser. 185.

[g] Schröckh, xxiv. 100-2.

[h] Hard. v. 87, seqq.

[i] C. 6. See vol. i. p. 378. The articles of Valence are supposed to have been drawn up by Ebbo, bishop of Grenoble, nephew of the deprived archbishop of Rheims. Ussher, 185.

[k] Cc. 2-4.

[m] Hincmar complains of this, i. 65, and in cc. 16, seqq., of his treatise on Predestination, defends the articles of Kiersy by quotations from the fathers.

[n] Hard. v. 498.

[o] Giesceler, II. i. 137.

[p] Conc. Tull. I. apud Saponarias, A.D. 859, c. 10 of introduction; also Pt. vi. cc. 1-6; Hincm. i. 2.

[q] Opera, i. 413, 438.

[r] "Te, trina Deitas unaque, poscimus." Hincmar argued that *Deitas* meant the *nature* of God, and altered *trina* into

defended the term, and Gottschalck—eager, it would seem, to provoke his powerful enemy in all ways—followed in a tract where he charged Hincmar with Sabellianism.[s] The archbishop replied in a work of which the substance was shown to Gottschalck, in the hope of converting him, although it was not completed until after his death.[t] He meets the charge of Sabellianism with one of Arianism;[u] he exhorts monks to keep clear of novelties in a style which seems to intimate that Gottschalck had many adherents among that class; and he gives very significant hints of the bodily and spiritual punishments to which an imitation of Gottschalck would render them liable.[x] Hincmar was not further molested about this affair, but the word to which he had objected kept its place in the Gallican service.

In 859, a monk of Hautvilliers named Guntbert, whom Gottschalck had gained, privately left the monastery, and carried an appeal from the prisoner to Rome.[y] It appeared as if the new pope, Nicolas, were disposed to take up the matter.[z] Hincmar wrote to him, professing his willingness to act as he should direct—to release Gottschalck, to transfer him to other custody, or even to send him to Rome (although he spoke of the two synods which had condemned the prisoner as a bar to this course); but he refused to appear with him before the pope's legates at Metz in 863, on an occasion which will be related hereafter.[a] From a letter written by Hincmar to Egilo, archbishop of Sens, who was about to set out for Rome, we learn some details as to Gottschalck's condition. It is said that in respect of food, drink, and fuel, he was as well treated as any of the monks among whom he lived; that clothes were supplied, if he would receive them; but that ever since he was placed at Hautvilliers he had refused to wash not only his body, but even his face and hands.[b] From another writing of Hincmar, it appears that the unfortunate man had become subject to strange delusions, and had visions in which the

summa.—"De una et non trina Deitate." Opera, i. 413-555; Gieseler, II. i. 137.

[s] Schedula Gotteschalci, ap. Hincm. i. 415-7.

[t] Hincm. i. 552.

[u] P. 418.

[x] Pp. 436-444.

[y] Hincmar describes Guntbert as having often before incurred punishment for faults, and charges him with having stolen horses, books, and vestments when he left the Abbey. ii. 290.

[z] Prudentius says in Annal. Bertin. 859 (Pertz, i. 464), that Nicolas gave a "Catholic" decision on the points in question—*i. e.* a decision agreeable to the writer's own views. But Hincmar, referring to this, says that he had never heard or read the statement elsewhere; and he commissions Egilo, archbishop of Sens, who was going to Rome, to beg that the pope would discountenance such misrepresentations. ii. 292.

[a] See below, p. 303; Hincm. ii. 264; Usser. 202; Schröckh, xxiv. 117.

[b] Hincm. ii. 292

imagery of the Apocalypse was applied to foreshow the ruin of his chief enemy. His long confinement and sufferings, acting on his vain, obstinate, and enthusiastic temper, had partially overthrown his reason.[c]

The synod to which that of Savonnières had deferred the consideration of the matters in controversy was never held. Hincmar, at the desire of Charles the Bald,[d] employed himself at intervals, from 859 to 863, in composing a work of great length on predestination and the kindred subjects,[e] chiefly in defence of the articles of Kiersy, which he had already maintained in a book of which the preface only is extant.[f] He labours to bring the theology of Augustine, Fulgentius, and others into accordance with his own opinions, which are rather those of the time before the Pelagian controversy arose. He quotes very profusely; but most of what he relies on as St. Augustine's is from a work falsely ascribed to that father.[g] He admits the expression of *one twofold* predestination,[h] but differs from Gottschalck in saying that, while the righteous are predestined to life, and it to them, punishment is predestined to the reprobate, but they are not predestined to it; that God did not predestinate them, but forsook them.[i] With this work the controversy ceased.

Gottschalck remained in captivity twenty years. In 869, the monks of Hautvilliers perceived that his end was approaching, and sent Hincmar notice of the fact, with an inquiry whether they should allow him to receive the last sacraments. It was replied that they might do so, if he would sign a confession embodying the archbishop's views as to Predestination and the Trinity. But Gottschalck was still unbending, and refused with much vehemence of behaviour and language. In consequence of this refusal, he died without the sacraments and under the ban of the church; he was buried in unhallowed earth, and was excluded from prayers for the repose of his soul.[k]

On the question of Gottschalck's orthodoxy or heterodoxy, very opposite opinions have been pronounced—a result rather of the opposite positions of those who have judged him than of any differences between them as to the facts of the case.[m] As to these

[c] De nn. et non trin. Deit. (Opera, i. 550); Gieseler, II. i. 137.

[d] Ep. ad Regem, Opera, i. 1.

[e] It fills 410 folio pages.

[f] A.D. 857; Fleury, xlix. 33.

[g] The 'Hypomnesticon,' published in the Appendix to vol. x. of Augustine.

[h] C. 19, p. 110.

[i] P. 373.

[k] Hincm. De non trin. Deit. (i. 552-5); ad monach. Altavill. (ii. 314.)

[m] The Jesuits are strong in condemnation of him; the Jansenists and Augustinian Romanists (as Hist. Litt. iv. 262),

facts, however, there is room for an important question—whether his two confessions embody the whole of his doctrine on the subject of predestination, or whether he held that opinion of an irresistible doom to sin as well as to punishment which his adversaries usually imputed to him. A moral judgment of the case is easier. Gottschalck's earnestness and resolute boldness were marred by his thoroughly sectarian spirit; but the harshness with which he was treated has left on the memory of Hincmar a stain which is not to be effaced by any allowances for the character of the age, since it drew forth the warm and indignant remonstrances even of contemporaries.

From controversies of doctrine we proceed to some remarkable cases in which questions of other kinds brought the popes into correspondence with the Frankish church.

I. In 855 the emperor Lothair resigned his crown, and entered the monastery of Prüm, where he died six days after his arrival.[n] While his eldest son, Louis II., succeeded him in the imperial title and in the kingdom of Italy, the small kingdom of Arles fell to his youngest son, Charles, and the other territory north of the Alps, to which the name of Lotharingia was now limited, became the portion of his second son, Lothair II.

Lothair II. in 856 married Theutberga, daughter of the duke or viceroy of Burgundy and sister of Humbert, abbot of St. Maurice. He separated from his wife in the following year, but Humbert, who was more a soldier than a monk, compelled him by a threat of war to take her back. In 859 Theutberga was summoned before a secular tribunal, on a charge of worse than incestuous connexion with her brother before her marriage,[o] and the abbot's character was not enough to disprove the accusation, as his laxity of morals was notorious.

It now appeared that, in desiring to get rid of his wife, Lothair was influenced by love for a lady named Waldrada, with whom he had formerly been intimate.[p] Two archbishops—Gunther, of Cologne, archchaplain of the court, and Theutgaud, of Treves, a man who is described as too simple and too ignorant to understand the case[q]—had been gained to the king's side,[r] and insisted that

with Protestant writers in general, are favourable to his orthodoxy, and suppose that his opinions were misunderstood. Gieseler, II. i. 138.

[n] Annal. Fuld. (Pertz, i. 368); Luden, vi. 44.

[o] Prudent. A.D. 860 (Pertz, i. 454); Hincmar. i. 575.

[p] Regino, A.D. 864 (Pertz, i. 571).

[q] Ibid.

[r] I agree with Dean Milman (ii. 361) in doubting the story that they were

Theutberga should purge herself by the ordeal of boiling water. She successfully underwent the trial by proxy, but Lothair declared that it was worthless. In the following year the subject came before two synods at Aix-la-Chapelle,[s] in which Wenilo, archbishop of Sens,[t] and another Neustrian prelate were associated with the Lotharingian bishops. Theutberga—no doubt influenced by ill usage, although she professed that she acted without compulsion—acknowledged the truth of the charges against her, but declared that she had not consented to the sin. The bishops gave judgment for a divorce, and, in compliance with the unhapy queen's own petition, sentenced her to lifelong penance in a nunnery.[u] A third synod, held at Aix in April 862, after hearing Lothair's representation of his case—that he had been contracted to Waldrada, that his father had compelled him to marry Theutberga, and that his youth and passions rendered a single life insupportable to him—gave its sanction to his marrying again.[x] His nuptials with Waldrada were celebrated, and were followed by her coronation.[y] Gunther's services were rewarded by the nomination of his brother Hilduin to the see of Cambray; but Hincmar refused to consecrate the new bishop, and the pope eventually declared the appointment to be null and void.[z] A.D. 860.

The partisans of Lothair had represented Hincmar as favourable to the divorce, but in reality he had steadfastly resisted all their solicitations.[a] A body of clergy and laity now proposed to him a number of questions on the subject,[b] and in answer he gave his judgment very fully.[c] There were, he said, only two valid grounds for the dissolution of a marriage—where either both parties desire to embrace a monastic life, or one of them can be proved guilty of adultery; but in the second case, the innocent party may not enter into another marriage during the life of the culprit.[d] Among other matters, he discusses the efficacy of the ordeal, which some of Theutberga's enemies had ridiculed as worthless, while others ex-

nearly related to Waldrada. Regino (in Pertz, i. 571-2) says that Gunther was won to take part against Theutberga by a promise that his niece should be queen; but this niece was clearly a different person from Waldrada.

[s] Hincm. ap. Pertz, i. 465.

[t] It has been supposed, more or less confidently, that from the conduct of this prelate came the name *Ganelon* (the same with *Wenilo* or *Guenilo*), given to the traitor of Carolingian romance. See Baron. 859. 30; British Magazine, xxiii. 260; Palgrave, Norm. and Eng. i. 166.

[u] Pertz, Leges, i. 467; Hincmar. i. 569, 574-7; Pagi, xiv. 564.

[x] Hard. v. 539, seqq.

[y] Hincm. Annal. 862 (Pertz, i. 453).

[z] Nic. Epp. 63-8; Gfrörer, i. 353.

[a] Hincm. i. 568, 583; Gfrörer, i. 350.

[b] Hincm. i. 565, 683.

[c] "De Divortio Lotharii et Tetbergæ." Opera, i. 561-705.

[d] Pp. 580, 588, 670, 681.

plained the fact that her proxy had escaped unhurt[e] by supposing either that she had made a secret confession, or that, in declaring herself clear of any guilt with her brother, she had mentally intended another brother instead of the abbot of St. Maurice.[f] Hincmar defends the system of such trials, and says that the artifice imputed to her, far from aiding her to escape, would have increased her guilt and would have ensured her ruin.[g] With respect to a popular opinion that Lothair was bewitched by Waldrada, the archbishop avows his belief in the power of charms to produce the extremes of love or hatred between man and wife, and otherwise to interfere with their relations to each other,[h] and he gives instances of magical practices as having occurred within his own knowledge. He strongly denies the doctrine which some had propounded, that Lothair, as a king, was exempt from all human judgment;[i] for, he said, the ecclesiastical power is higher than the secular, and when a king fails to rule himself and his dominions according to the law of God, he forfeits his immunity from earthly law.[k] He says that the question of the marriage, as it is one of universal concern, cannot be settled within Lothair's dominions; and, as it was objected that no one but the pope was of higher authority than those who had already given judgment on it, he proposes a general synod, to be assembled from all the Frankish kingdoms, as the fittest tribunal for deciding it.[m]

Theutberga had escaped from the place of her confinement, and had found a refuge with Charles the Bald, who espoused her cause less out of any regard for its justice than in the hope of turning his nephew's misconduct to his own advantage.[n] She now appealed to the pope, whose intervention was also solicited by others, and at last by Lothair himself, who was annoyed by the opposition of Hincmar and the Neustrian bishops.[o] Nicolas hereupon said that, even if the stories against Theutberga were true, her immoralities would not warrant the second marriage of Lothair; he ordered that a synod should be assembled, not only from such parts of the

[e] "Incoctus."

[f] P. 499.

[g] P. 613. There is also a letter on the Ordeal, ii. 676.

[h] Pp. 653, seqq.

[i] This was a pretension derived from Justinian. (Gfrörer, i. 396.) It had been carried still further by a synod held at Constantinople in the reign of Nicephorus, which, with reference to the divorce and second marriage of Constantine VI., declared that the Emperor was above law, and was not bound by what bound other men. Schlosser, 363.

[k] "*Rex* a *regendo* dicitur," &c. (i. 674-6), a favourite sentence in councils &c. of the time.

[m] Pp. 683-7.

[n] Gfrörer, i. 352-3.

[o] Planck, iii. 41.

Frankish dominions as Lothair might hope to influence, but from all; and he sent two legates to assist at it,[p] with a charge to excommunicate the king, if he should refuse to appear, or to obey them.

The synod was held at Metz, in 863, but no bishops except those of Lotharingia attended.[q] The legates had been bribed by Lothair; one of them, Rodoald, had already displayed his corruptness in negotiations with the Byzantine church.[r] Without any citation of Theutberga, or any fresh investigation of the case, the acts of the synod of Aix were confirmed. Nicolas represents the tone of the bishops as very violent against himself, and says that when one bishop, in signing the acts, had made a reservation of the papal judgment, Gunther and Theutgaud erased all but his name.[s] These two prelates set off to report the decision to the pope—believing probably, from what they had seen of Rodoald, that at Rome money would effect all that they or their sovereign might desire.[t] But in this they found themselves greatly mistaken. Nicolas, in a synod which appears to have been held in the ordinary course,[u] annulled the decision of Metz, classing the council with the notorious *Latrocinium* of Ephesus,[x] and ordering that, on account of the favour which it had shown to adulterers, it should not be called a synod but a brothel.[y] He deposed Gunther and Theutgaud, and declared that, if they should attempt to perform any episcopal act, they must not hope for restoration.[z] He threatened the other Lotharingian bishops with a like sentence in case of their making any resistance;[a] and he announced his judgment to the Frankish sovereigns and archbishops in letters which strongly denounced the conduct of king Lothair—if (it was said) he may be properly stated a king who gives himself up to the government of his passions.[b] Rodoald was about to be brought to trial for his corruption, when he escaped from Rome by night.[c] It was evident from the manner of the pope's proceedings that the indignation which he sincerely felt on account of Theutberga's

[p] Nic. Epp. 17, 18, 19, 22, 23. Instructions to the legates, Hard. v. 319-20.

[q] Gfrörer thinks that Louis of Germany persuaded Charles the Bald and Charles of Provence not to send their bishops. i. 360.

[r] See the next chapter. Gfrörer (i. 363) thinks that Nicolas made use of him with the intention of turning his notorious venality to account.

[s] Hard. v. 292.

[t] Hincm. Ann. 863 (Pertz, i. 460); Planck, iii. 51-2; Gfrörer, i. 361-3.

[u] Conc. Rom. A.D. 863; Planck, iii. 55.

[x] See vol. i. pp. 423-5.

[y] "Prostibulum." Hard. v. 573, c. i.; Pertz, i. 375-6; Anastas. 257-8.

[z] C. 2.

[a] C. 3.

[b] Ep. ad Archiep. Germ. Pertz, i. 375; Hincm. Annal. ib. 460; Ep. ad Carol. et Ludov. Hard. v. 244.

[c] Hinc. Annal. ap. Pertz, i. 460.

wrongs was not the only motive which animated him; that he was bent on taking advantage of the case to establish his power over kings and foreign churches.[d]

Gunther and Theutgaud, in extreme surprise and anger, repaired to the emperor Louis II., who was then at Beneventum, and represented to him that the treatment which they had received was an insult not only to their master, but to the whole Frankish church, and to all princes—especially to himself, under whose safe-conduct they had come to Rome.[e] On this Louis immediately advanced against Rome, and without attempting to negotiate with the pope, entered the city. Nicolas set on foot solemn prayers, with fasting, for the change of the emperor's heart. Penitential processions moved about the streets and visited the churches; but as a train of penitents was about to ascend the steps of St. Peter's, it was violently assaulted by some of the imperial soldiers. Crosses and banners were broken in the fray; one large cross of especial sanctity, which was believed to be the gift of the empress Helena to St. Peter's see, and to contain a piece of the wood on which the Redeemer suffered, was thrown down and trodden in the mire, from which the fragments were picked up by some English pilgrims. Nicolas, in fear lest he should be seized, left the Lateran palace, crossed the river in a boat, and took refuge in St. Peter's, where for two days and nights he remained without food.[f] But in the mean while signs which seemed to declare the wrath of heaven began to appear. The soldier who had broken the precious cross died. Louis himself was seized with a fever, and in alarm sent his empress to mediate with the pope. A reconciliation was thus effected, and after having committed many acts of violence, the troops withdrew from Rome.[g] The emperor ordered Gunther and Theutgaud to leave his camp and to return home, and it would seem that Nicolas had stipulated for freedom of action in his proceedings as to the case of Lothair.[h]

A.D. 864.

Gunther had drawn up, in his own name and in that of his brother archbishop, a protest against their deposition, conceived in terms which Hincmar describes as diabolical and unprecedented.[i] In this document Nicolas is charged with madness and tyrannic fury, with extravagant pride and assumption, with fraud and

[d] Planck, iii. 57-60.

[e] Hincm. A.D. 864, ap. Pertz, i. 462; Regino, A.D. 865, ib. 573.

[f] Hincm. ap. Pertz, i. 463.

[g] Ib. 463-4.

[h] Planck, iii. 70.

[i] Hincmar's expressions, however, are nothing to those of Baronius, 863. 31.

cunning, with outrageous violation of all the forms of justice and ecclesiastical laws; the archbishops declare that they spurn and defy his accursed sentence—that they are resolved not to admit him into their communion, "being content with the communion and brotherly society of the whole church;" and they conclude by asserting that Waldrada was not a concubine but a wife, inasmuch as she had been contracted to Lothair before his union with Theutberga.[k] With this paper Gunther now sent his brother Hilduin to the pope, charging him, if it were refused, to lay it on the high altar of St. Peter's. Hilduin executed the commission, forcing his way into St. Peter's with a party of Gunther's adherents, who beat the guardians of the church and killed one of them who resisted.[m] Gunther also circulated the protest among the German bishops, and sent a copy of it to Photius, of Constantinople, with whom Nicolas was by this time seriously embroiled.[n] The other Lotharingian bishops, however, were terrified by the pope's threats, or were gained by his promises, and made submission to him in very abject terms.[o]

Gunther had hurried from Rome to Cologne; in defiance of the pope's sentence he had performed episcopal functions; and he had made a compact with his canons, by which, at a great sacrifice both of power and of revenue, he drew them into concurrence in his proceedings.[p] The pusillanimous Lothair—partly influenced by the demonstrations of his uncles against him—now abandoned the cause of the deposed metropolitans. He gave up Gunther altogether, and expressed horror at his acts, while he entreated that Theutgaud, in consideration of his simple character, and of his obedience to the pope's judgment, might be more leniently dealt with. As for himself, he professed himself willing to go to Rome, and to obey the pope "like one of the meanest of men."[q] Gunther, indignant at finding himself thus sacrificed, declared an intention of exposing all the king's proceedings, and set out for Rome, carrying with him as much of the treasures of his see as he could lay hands on, in the hope that by such means he might be able to propitiate the pope. But he was again disappointed; Nicolas in a synod renewed the condemnation which had been passed both on him and on Theutgaud.[r] In the meantime Lothair bestowed the

[k] The protest is given by Hincm. Annal. 864 (Pertz, vol. i.); also in the Ann. Fuldens. but without the preface.

[m] Hincm. Annal. p. 464.

[n] Planck, iii. 74-5.

[o] See the letters of Adventius of Metz, and others relating to him, in Hard. v. 321-5.

[p] Hincm. Annal. p. 465.

[q] Ep. ad Nicol. Hard. v. 336. Letters of Nicolas as to the two archbishops, Nos. 56, 58, in Hard.

[r] Hincm. ap. Pertz, i. 465; Gfrörer, i. 397.

archbishoprick of Cologne on Hugh abbot of St. Bertin's, whom Hincmar describes as a subdeacon, but of habits which would have been discreditable to a layman. The preferment was probably a reward for the exertion of the abbot's influence with Charles the Bald, to whom he was maternally related.[s]

The meanness of Lothair's behaviour served only to increase the contempt and disgust with which Nicolas had before regarded him. The pope wrote to the other Frankish princes, desiring them not to interfere in the matter, as it was for his own judgment alone; and it is remarked by Hincmar that in these letters he made no use of such terms of courtesy as had been usual in the letters of Roman bishops to sovereigns.[t] He sent Arsenius, bishop of Orba, as his legate, with orders to visit Louis of Germany and Charles; but it was declared that, unless Lothair would give up Waldrada, the legate must hold no communication with him, nor would the king be admitted to an audience if he should repair to Rome. Arsenius received Theutberga from the hands of Charles, and delivered her to Lothair, who, in terror at the pope's threats of excommunication, swore on the Gospels and a fragment of the true cross, that he would always treat her with the honour due to a queen, imprecating on himself the most fearful judgments both in this world and in the next, if he should fail. Twelve of his nobles joined in the oath, and the reunion of the royal pair was sealed by a new coronation.[u] Waldrada was committed to the care of the legate, but in the course of his return to Rome both she and another royal lady of light character, Ingeltrude,[x] wife of count Boso, contrived to make their escape from him. Waldrada rejoined Lothair, who had planned her escape.[y] The king had cast aside all regard for his oath almost immediately after having sworn it. His submissiveness towards the pope was forgotten. He ejected Hugh from Cologne, confirmed Gunther's arrangement with the canons, and put Hilduin into the see as nominal archbishop, while both the power and the revenues were really in the hands of Gunther.[z]

A.D. 865.

Aug. 13, 865.

Theutberga now again ran away from her husband, and, worn out by the miseries to which she had been subjected, petitioned the pope for a dissolution of the marriage. She went so far as even to own Waldrada to be the rightful wife of Lothair, and she

[s] Hincm, ap. Pertz, i. 465; Gfrörer, i. 369, 370.

[t] Hincm. ap. Pertz, i. 468. See Planck, iii. 84.

[u] Hincm. A.D. 865, pp. 468-9.

[x] See Baron. 862. 33; 865. 63.

[y] Annal. Fuld. 867. ap. Pertz, t. i.; Regino, ib. p. 574; Hard. v. 270, 274, 279.

[z] Hincm. Ann. 866, p. 471.

requested leave to repair to Rome and tell all her story. But Nicolas was firm in asserting the rights which the unhappy queen had been wrought on to abandon. He solemnly excommunicated Waldrada; he charged the Frankish bishops to hold Lothair separate from the church until he should repent of his misdeeds. He told Theutberga that he could not comply with a request which was evidently made under constraint; that, if Lothair's marriage were to be dissolved, any man might by ill usage get rid of his wife; that she must consider herself as under the protection of the Apostolic see; that instead of travelling to Rome, she should persuade Lothair to send Waldrada thither for trial; and in all his letters he insisted on celibacy on Lothair's part as a necessary condition of any separation.[a] Lothair again attempted to pacify the pope by flattery; he assured him that he had not cohabited with Waldrada, or even seen her, since her return from Italy;[b] but Nicolas was unmoved, and appeared to be on the point of pronouncing a sentence of excommunication against the king, when he was arrested by death in May, 867.[c]

The increase of the papal power under this pontiff was immense. He had gained such a control over princes as was before unknown. He had taken the unexampled steps of deposing foreign metropolitans, and of annulling the decisions of a Frankish national council by the vote of a Roman synod. He had neglected all the old canonical formalities which stood in the way of his exercising an immediate jurisdiction throughout the western church. And in all this he had been supported by the public feeling of indignation against Lothair and his subservient clergy, which caused men to overlook the novelty and the usurping character of the pope's measures. The other Frank princes had encouraged him in his proceedings against Lothair. The great prelates of Lotharingia, strong in position and in family interest, had rendered themselves powerless before the bishop of Rome by espousing a discreditable and unpopular cause.[d] The pope appeared, not as an invader of the rights of sovereigns and of churches, but as the champion of justice and innocence against the oppressors of the earth.

Adrian II., the successor of Nicolas, had already twice declined the papacy, and was seventy-five years of age at the time of his election. The partisans of the late pope apprehended a change

[a] Annal Fuld. 867; Regino, ap. Pertz, i. 574-5; Nic. Epp. 48-51.
[b] Loth. ap. Baron. 866. 42.
[c] Planck, iii. 90-2; Gfrörer, i. 425.
[d] Planck, iii. 94, Gfrörer, i. 365; Milm. ii. 363.

of policy, by which the recent acquisitions might be lost.[e] But in this they were mistaken. Adrian appears to have been urged on by a feeling that he was expected to show want of energy. He soon cast aside the air of humility and of deference towards the emperor which he had at first displayed. The losses which the papacy suffered under him arose, not from a reversal of his predecessor's policy, but from the attempt to carry it on in an exaggerated form, without the skill of Nicolas, without understanding the change of circumstances, or the manner of adapting his measures to it.[f]

The beginning of Adrian's pontificate was marked by a tragedy among his own nearest connexions. The pope, himself the son of a bishop,[g] had been married—a circumstance which contributed to the alarm felt at his election, as Nicolas, like other chief agents in the advancement of the papal power, had been strenuous for the celibacy of the clergy.[h] Adrian's wife and a daughter were still alive, but, within a few days after his election, the daughter was carried off by a son of Arsenius,[i] who, on being pursued, killed both her and her mother, and was himself slain by the emperor's officers. Arsenius, with whose intrigues this affair was connected, himself died soon after. It is said that on his deathbed he was heard to discourse with fiends, and that he did not receive the Eucharist.[k]

Lothair conceived fresh hopes from the change of popes, and wrote to Adrian in terms expressive of high regard for his predecessor, while he complained that Nicolas had wronged him by listening to idle rumours.[m] At his request, Adrian released Waldrada from her excommunication, and he invited the king to Rome. "Rome," he said, "is never unjust, and is always willing to receive the penitent. If you are conscious of innocence, come for a blessing; if guilty, come for the remedy of a suitable repentance."[n] Theutberga was also persuaded by Lothair to renew her application for a divorce. She went to Rome in person, and, in addition to the old grounds, alleged that she had ailments which

[e] Anast. Bibl. Ep. ad Adon. Viennens. ap. Hard. v. 390; Vita Adrian. annexed to Anastasius ap. Muratori. iii. 263.

[f] Planck, iii. 149; Gieseler, II. i. 198; Gfrörer, ii. 3.

[g] Vita, ap. Muratori, iii. 261.

[h] This appears from the letter of Anastasius to Ado, where it is said that all whom Nicolas had rebuked "pro diverso *adulterii* genere," or for other causes, were bent on overthrowing his work. Hard. v. 390.

[i] The same Arsenius who has been already mentioned.

[k] Hincm. Ann. 868; Pertz, i. 477.

[m] The letter is in Regino. Ann. 868 (Pertz, i. 579).

[n] Regino, ib.

rendered it impossible to perform the duties of a wife. But Adrian, like Nicolas, refused her request, on the ground that she was acting under constraint, and desired her to return home.[o]

Waldrada's absolution had included the condition that she should not keep company with Lothair.[p] By artfully affecting to obey this order, she goaded his passion to madness, so that he resolved at all risks—even leaving his territory open to the restless ambition of his uncle Charles—to sue in person to the pope for a dissolution of his union with Theutberga. He was made to pay heavily for the means of approach to the pontiff, who, by the intervention of Ingilberga, wife of the emperor Louis, was prevailed on to meet him at Monte Cassino, where it was supposed that Adrian might be more tractable than among the partisans of Nicolas at Rome. Adrian refused to dissolve the marriage, but, in consideration of a large sum of money, agreed to administer the Eucharist to him — a favour which Lothair desired in order to dissipate the popular opinion which regarded him as virtually excommunicate. "If," said the pope at the solemnity, "you have observed the charge of Nicolas, and are firmly resolved never to have intercourse with Waldrada, draw near, and receive unto salvation; but if your conscience accuses you, or if you purpose to return to wallow in your uncleanness, refrain, lest that which is ordained as a remedy for the faithful should turn to your damage." Lothair, in surprise and agitation, received the consecrated symbols. His nobles, after being adjured as to their consent or privity to any breach of his oath, communicated after him. Gunther, the survivor of the deposed archbishops, who had once more repaired to Italy in the hope of obtaining a release,[q] was admitted to communicate as a layman, on presenting a written submission to the pope, and swearing never again to exercise any spiritual office unless the pope should, in compassion, be pleased to relieve him from his disability.[r] A.D. 869.

The king followed Adrian to Rome, but a change had come over the pope's disposition towards him. Instead of being received with the honours usually paid to sovereigns, he found no one of the clergy to meet him when he presented himself at St. Peter's, and

[o] Hincm. A.D. 867, p. 476; Schröckh, xxii. 163.

[p] Hincm. Annal. p. 477; Hard. v. 704-5.

[q] Hincm. Annal. 867. Theutgaud, on acknowledging the consecration of Adrian, had been admitted to communion. Baron. 867. 147.

[r] Hincm. Annal. 869, p. 481; Regino, pp. 581-3. Hincmar, Gfrörer (ii. 18), and Jaffé (257) place this scene at Monte Cassino; Fleury (li. 23), Pagi (xv. 154), Schröckh (xxii., 167), and Sismondi (iii. 155-8), after the pope's return to Rome. Regino says nothing of the visit to Monte Cassino.

he was obliged to approach the Apostle's tomb unattended. On retiring to his lodging in the papal palace, he found it unfurnished, and even unswept. On the following day, which was Sunday, he again repaired to the church, but no priest appeared to say mass for him. Next day, however, by sending presents to the pope, he obtained an invitation to dinner, Adrian gave him gifts in return, and they parted on friendly terms.[s]

Adrian resolved to examine the case of the divorce in a council which was to be held at Rome in the following year. With a view to this, he summoned the bishops of the three Frankish kingdoms to send representatives to the council; and he was about to send commissioners across the Alps for the purpose of inquiry, when he received tidings of Lothair's death.[t] The king had left Rome in the middle of July. At Lucca a fatal sickness broke out among his attendants. He himself died at Piacenza, on the 8th of August; and it is said that before the end of the year all who had partaken of the communion at Monte Cassino were dead, while the few who had abstained from it survived.[u] Theutberga entered a monastery, and bestowed large sums for the soul of the husband who had so cruelly injured her. Waldrada also took refuge in a cloister.[x]

II. In the question of Lothair's divorce, Nicolas and Hincmar were led by the common interests of justice and morality to act in harmony with each other. But in other cases, the conflict between the claims of Rome and the archbishop's attachment either to his sovereign or to the national church of France placed him in opposition to Nicolas and his successors.

One of these cases arose out of the conduct of Ebbo, who, as we have seen,[y] had been deprived of the see of Rheims for his acts of rebellion against Louis the Pious. During the contests between that emperor's sons, Rheims for a time fell into the possession of the emperor Lothair, with whom Ebbo had ingratiated himself. The archbishop returned to his see, carrying with him, in addition to the imperial mandate for his restoration, the favourable judgment of a synod held at Ingelheim,[z] under Lothair's influence, and under the presidency of Drogo, of Metz,

A.D. 841.

[s] Hincm. Annal. p. 482.

[t] Ibid.; Gfrörer, ii. 18.

[u] Hincm. Ann. p. 482; Regino, p. 581; Sigeb. Gembl. ap. Bouquet, vii. 251. Perhaps the circumstances of the mortality may have been accommodated by popular belief to the expectation of a judgment on perjury. But there seems to be no ground whatever for the suspicion of Sismondi, who says that the clergy, regarding the communion as an ordeal, and expecting a miracle, *did not care what they gave the king*. iii. 156.

[x] Laden, vi.

[y] P. 246.

[z] June, 840; Pertz, Leges, i. 374.

who had also presided at his deposition. He explained away the penitential professions which he had made at Thionville,[a] by saying that, in declaring himself *unworthy* of his see, he meant nothing more than what was signified by the same word in the ordinary style of bishops;[b] he had humbled himself (he said), and therefore had now risen in greater strength than before.[c]

After the battle of Fontenay, Ebbo fled from Rheims in fear of Charles the Bald. He in vain attempted to obtain restitution by means of Sergius II.; but the pope, overruling the ancient canons against the translation of bishops, sanctioned his appointment to Hildesheim, on the nomination of Louis the German, in 844.[d]

Hincmar, soon after his promotion to the archbishoprick of Rheims, in 845, found that some clerks, of whom one Wulfad was the most prominent, had been ordained by Ebbo during his second occupation of the see.[e] He denied the validity of orders conferred by one whom he regarded as an intruder, and, on their application to a synod held at Soissons, in 853, the case was investigated by a commission of bishops, who declared Ebbo's restoration to have been uncanonical, and the orders which he had given to be void. Wulfad and his brethren would have been excluded even from lay communion, on the ground that, by charging some members of the synod with having received their consecration from Ebbo, they had incurred the sentence denounced by the council of Elvira against those who should slander bishops;[f] but at the request of Charles the Bald they were released from this penalty.[g] Hincmar, as being a party in the case, and as the regularity of his own appointment had been impugned, requested Leo IV. to confirm the judgment. The pope refused, on the ground (among other things) that the clerks had appealed to Rome; but Lothair, hitherto the archbishop's enemy, interceded for him, and Leo sent him the pall by which he was constituted primate of Neustria.[h] Benedict III. on Hincmar's application, confirmed the privileges thus bestowed on him, and declared that there should be no appeal from his judgment, saving the rights of the apostolic see; he also confirmed the deposition of Wulfad and his companions, with the condition that the facts of the case were as they had been

A.D. 855.

[a] See p. 246.

[b] Documents not uncommonly began or were subscribed "Ego N. indignus episcopus."

[c] Hard. iv. 1447-1552.

[d] Flodoard ap. Bouquet, vii. 212; Hard. v. 49; Hincmar, ii. 305.

[e] Hincm. ii. 306.

[f] Conc. Eliber. A.D. 305? c. 75.

[g] Pertz, Leges, i. 416; Hard.[3] v. 48-52.

[h] Gfrörer, i. 238-240, who, of course, has his theory as to the reason of Lothair's conduct.

represented to him.[i] And Nicolas, in 863, renewed both the grant to Hincmar and the judgment as to the clerks, with the same condition which had been stated by his predecessor.[k]

A.D. 866. But three years later this pope professed to have discovered great unfairness in the statements on which the applications to Benedict and to himself had been made, and he ordered that Hincmar should either restore the clerks, or should submit the matter to a council, with leave for them, if its judgment should be unfavourable, to appeal to the apostolic see.[m] A second synod was accordingly held at Soissons. Hincmar handed in four tracts,[n] in justification of Ebbo's deposition, of his own appointment, and of the proceedings against the clerks—to whose restoration, however, he professed himself willing to consent, provided that it could be granted without prejudice to the laws of the church. The council decided that the deposition had been right in point of justice, but that it might be reversed by the higher law of mercy, according to the precedent of the Nicene judgment as to the Meletions,[o] and to the provisions of the African church for the reconciliation of the Donatists.[p] But Nicolas, instead of confirming the acts, strongly censured the council, for having omitted to cancel the judgment of that which had been held in 853; he blamed it for having sanctioned the promotion of Wulfad by Charles the Bald to the see of Bourges,[q] without requesting his own consent; he told the bishops that they ought to have sent him all the documents relating to Ebbo, and that they must now do so; and, in letters to them, to Charles, and to Hincmar, he charged the archbishop with falsehood, fraud, cunning, and injustice.[r] At the same time he wrote to Wulfad and his brethren, exhorting them to pay due reverence to Hincmar.[s]

A new investigation took place before a council assembled from six provinces at Troyes in October 867,[t] when the deposition of Ebbo and the appointment of his successor again came into question. The decision was in favour of Hincmar; but the council

[i] Hincmar, ii. 310, 855; Schröckh, xxii. 134-5.

[k] Hard. v. 326.

[m] Nic. ad Hincm.; Hard. v. 601-2.

[n] Opera, ii. 265, or Hard. v. 608-620.

[o] See vol. i. p. 184.

[p] See vol. i. p. 375; Hard. v. 626; Hincm. Annal. 866, p. 472.

[q] See Hincm. Annal. p. 472.

[r] Nic. Ep. ad Synod. ap. Hard. v. 633-40; ad Hincm. ib. 640; ad Cazal. ib. 648; Gfrörer, i. 495-6. He also reproached him for using the pall at other than the times allowed by the Apostolic see; to which the archbishop replied that he hardly used it at all, except at Christmas and Easter, and speaks with something like indifference about it. Hard. v. 647, 667.

[s] Hard. v. 649.

[t] Hard. v. 679, seqq.; Hincm. Annal. p. 475.

did an important service to the papal interest by desiring Nicolas to decree that no archbishop or bishop should be deposed without the consent of the apostolic see.[w] Hincmar and Nicolas were at last brought nearer to each other on this question by their respective dangers from other quarters. The archbishop was afraid of the influence which Wulfad had acquired over Charles the Bald, while the pope, who was now engaged in a formidable struggle with the patriarch Photius and the Greeks, was unwilling to tempt the Franks to side with his opponents. On receiving the envoys whom Hincmar had sent to Rome after the synod of Troyes, Nicolas expressed approbation of the archbishop's proceedings, and wrote to request that he and other learned men of France would assist in the controversy with the Greeks.[x] With this request Hincmar complied, and soon after Nicolas was succeeded by Adrian, who confirmed Wulfad in the see of Bourges and bestowed the pall on him, but at the same time behaved with great respect to Hincmar.[y]

Thus the dispute ended peacefully. But in the course of it much had been done to infringe on the independence of the Frankish church. Nicolas claimed that its synods should be called by order of the pope; that the parties in a cause might appeal from such synods to Rome either before or after judgment; that the synods should report to the pope before pronouncing their sentence; that the bishops who acted as judges should be compelled to go to Rome for the purpose of justifying their decision; that the pope should have the power of annulling their whole proceedings, so that it should be necessary to begin the process anew.[z] Hincmar and his party, while they rested on the ancient laws of the church, felt themselves unable to struggle against the complication of political interests; the archbishop found himself obliged to concede the principle of an appeal to Rome, according to the canon of Sardica, although Charlemagne had excluded that canon from his collection, and it owed its insertion among the Frank canons to the forger Benedict the Levite.[a] And the petition of the council of Troyes—suggested, no doubt, by the punishments to which Ebbo and others had been subjected on account of their acts against Louis the Pious—shows how, under the idea of securing

[w] Hard. v. 675, 681.

[x] Nic. Ep. 70 ap. Hard. v. 307, seqq.; Hincm. Annal. 867, pp. 475-6; Schröckh, xxii. 142.

[y] Hard. v. 691; Gfrörer, i. 499-502; ii. 1-3.

[z] Schröckh, xxii. 143.

[a] Gieseler, II. i. 63. See above, p. 139.

themselves against other powers, they contributed to aggrandise Rome by investing it with universal control in the character of general protector of the church.[b]

III. At the same time with the affair as to Ebbo's ordinations another controversy was going on between Nicolas and Hincmar, which exhibited in a yet more striking manner the nature of the new claims set up in behalf of the papacy.

Rothad, bishop of Soissons, in the province of Rheims, had occupied his see thirty years, and had long been on unfriendly terms with the archbishop.[c] The accounts which we have of the differences between the bishop and his metropolitan must be received with caution, as they come for the most part from Rothad, or from the Lotharingian bishops, who were hostile to Hincmar on account of his proceedings in the case of Theutberga; while they are in part directly contradicted by Hincmar himself.[d]

Rothad, it is said,[e] with the consent of thirty-three bishops, deposed a presbyter who had been caught in the act of unchastity. The man carried his complaint to Hincmar, who restored him to his benefice after three years of penance, excommunicated and imprisoned the clerk whom Rothad had put into it, and persecuted the bishop himself for his share in the affair. According to this account, it would seem that Rothad had ventured to invade the rights of his metropolitan by holding a synod independently of him.[f] But in addition to this, Hincmar, while disclaiming all personal malice against Rothad, charges him with long insubordination, with notorious laxity of life, and with dilapidating, selling, or pledging the property of his see.[g] However their disagreement may have arisen, Hincmar in 861 suspended Rothad from his office until he should become obedient, and threatened him with deposition; whereupon the bishop appealed to Rome.[h]

In the following year, Rothad appeared at a synod held at Pistres,[i] as if no censure had been passed against him. His presence was objected to, on which he again appealed to the pope, and asked leave to go to Rome, which Charles the Bald at first granted. But the case was afterwards, with the concurrence of Charles, examined by synods at Soissons

A.D. 862.

[b] Planck, iii. 143-7; Gieseler, ii. 1. 197.
[c] Schröckh, xxii. 135.
[d] Ib. 145.
[e] Rothad. ap. Hard. v. 581; Nic. Ep. 29, ib. 249.
[f] Gfrörer, i. 464.
[g] Opera, ii. 248, 251-3.
[h] Schröckh, xxii. 144; Planck, iii. 103.
[i] Near Pont de l'Arche, on the Seine.

and at Senlis, in 863. Rothad was imprisoned for a time, and at Senlis he was sentenced to deposition, while an abbey was assigned to him for his maintenance, and another person was appointed to his see.[k] Hincmar represents him as having been content with this arrangement, until some Lotharingian bishops, wishing to use him as a tool against the great opponent of their sovereign's divorce, persuaded him to resume his appeal to the pope.[m] Rothad's own statement is, that Hincmar, having got possession of a letter in which he requested a continuance of support from some bishops who had befriended him at Pistres, wrongly represented this as an abandonment of his appeal, and a reference of his cause to those Frankish bishops.[n]

Hincmar and the bishops who had met at Senlis, by way of obviating the pope's objections to their proceedings, requested Nicolas to confirm their acts; in excuse for their disregard of Rothad's appeal, they alleged that the old imperial laws forbade such cases to be carried out of the kingdom. But Nicolas had received representations of the affair from the bishops of Lotharingia, and replied by censuring the synod very strongly for the insult which it had offered to St. Peter by presuming to judge a matter in which an appeal had been made to Rome.[o] In consequence of that appeal, he declared their judgment to be null. Temporal laws, he said, are good against heretics and tyrants, but are of no force when they clash with the rights of the church.[p] He tells them that they must either restore Rothad to his see, or within thirty days send deputies to assert their cause against him before the apostolical tribunal.[q] With his usual skill, he assumes the character of a general protector of the church by telling the bishops that the same which had happened to Rothad might befall any one of themselves, and he points out the chair of St. Peter as the refuge for bishops oppressed by their metropolitans.[r] Nicolas also wrote to Hincmar in terms of severe censure.[s] He told them that, if Rothad had not appealed, he must himself have inquired into the matter—a claim of right to interfere which had not before been advanced by Rome.[t] He asked how their envoy could apply for a confirmation of his privileges as metropolitan to the Roman see, while he did all that he could to lessen its authority;[u]

[k] Hincm. Annal. 862-3; Opera, ii. 249; Gfrörer, ii. 465.
[m] Opera, ii. 249.
[n] Roth. Libellus, ap. Hard. v. 580. See Planck, iii. 104.
[o] Ep. 32, ap. Hard. v. 254, seqq.
[p] Col. 256, a.
[q] Col. 257-8.
[r] Compare the letters to Charles and Hincmar. Hard. v. 248, 257.
[s] Ep. 28.
[t] Planck, iii. 114-7.
[u] C. 248.

and, as the first letter received no answer, he wrote again, telling the archbishop that within thirty days he must either reinstate Rothad or send him and some representatives of his accusers to Rome, on pain of being interdicted from the celebration of the Eucharist until he should comply.[x] He also wrote to Rothad, encouraging him to persevere in his appeal unless he were conscious of having a bad cause;[y] and, notwithstanding the importunities of Charles and his queen, who entreated him to let the matter rest, he desired the king to send Rothad to Rome.[z] The second letter to Hincmar, and two which followed it, remained unanswered; a fifth was in a milder tone, as Nicolas was afraid to drive the archbishop to extremities, lest he should join the party of Gunther.[a]

In the beginning of 864, Rothad obtained permission to go to Rome. Hincmar also sent two envoys—not, he said, as accusers, but in order to justify his proceedings.[b] They carried with them a letter of great length,[c] in which, with profuse expressions of humility and reverence towards the apostolic see, he admits the right of appeal as sanctioned by the Sardican canon, but says that, according to the African canons and to Gregory the Great, Rothad, by referring the case to judges of his own choosing, had foregone the right of carrying it to any other tribunal.[d] He tells the pope that Rothad had for many years been unruly and had treated all remonstrances with contempt, so that he himself had incurred much obloquy for allowing a man so notoriously unfit and incorrigible to retain his office.[e] He dwells much on the necessity that bishops should obey their metropolitans, and endeavours very earnestly to obtain the pope's confirmation of his past proceedings, assuring him that Rothad shall be well provided for.[f]

Hincmar's envoys were detained on the way by the emperor Louis, but the letter reached the pope.[g] Rothad was allowed to proceed to Rome, and, six months after his arrival, presented to Nicolas a statement of his case.[h] On Christmas-eve, three months later, the pope ascended the pulpit of one of the principal churches, and made a speech on the subject. Even if Hincmar's story were true, he said, it was no longer in the power of Rothad, after he

[x] Ep. 29.
[y] Epp. 33-4.
[z] Epp. 30, 35.
[a] Gfrörer, i. 471.
[b] Opera, ii. 247.
[c] Ib. 244, seqq. Hincmar says that the pope appears to be troubled by his *multiloquium*; but he goes on to allege St. Augustine on behalf of it, and he certainly does not correct it. ii. 247.
[d] Pp. 248, 251.
[e] P. 248.
[f] Pp. 258-9; Planck, iii. 117-120.
[g] Hincm. Annal. 864. ap. Pertz. i. 465.
[h] Hincm. Annal. v. 579.

had appealed to the apostolic see, to transfer his cause to an inferior tribunal; since Rothad professed himself willing to meet all charges, and since no answer had appeared against him, he declared him to be worthy of restoration;[i] and, after having waited until the feast of St. Agnes, publicly invested the bishop with pontifical robes, and desired him to officiate at mass before him.[k] Jan. 21, 865.

As Rothad maintained that he had never abandoned his appeal, and as his accusers had suffered judgment to go by default, the proceedings of Nicolas thus far might have been justified by the Sardican canon, which suspended the execution of sentence against a bishop until the pope should have submitted the cause to a fresh examination; and Hincmar had failed in the observance of that canon by appointing another bishop to Soissons.[m] But in letters which he wrote on the occasion,[n] he gave vent to some startling novelties—that the *Decretals* of his predecessors had been violated; that the deposition of Rothad was invalid, because the council which had pronounced it was held without the apostolic permission, and, further, because the deposition of a bishop was one of those "greater judgments," which belong to the apostolic chair alone.[o] He required Hincmar, on pain of perpetual deposition, either at once unconditionally to restore Rothad, or to reinstate him for the time, and to appear at Rome for the further trial of the question.[p]

Nicolas had originally stood on the Sardican canon, but he now took very different ground; and the change was the more striking, because the new principles which he advanced were really unnecessary to his cause.[q] These principles were derived from the pretended Decretals of Isidore, which are for the first time mentioned as being known at Rome in the letter of Nicolas to the French bishops.[r] In 860, Lupus of Ferrières, at the instigation of Wenilo, archbishop of Sens,[s] had written a letter in which he hinted a reference to them by saying that pope Melchiades, the contemporary of Constantine, was reported to have expressed certain opinions, and requesting that Nicolas would send a copy of the decretal as preserved at Rome. From the pope's silence as to this point in his

[i] Hard. v. 583-4.

[k] Anastas. 322.

[m] Planck, iii. 122-5; Gieseler, II. i. 196.

[n] Ad Cler. et pleb. Eccl. Rom. ap. Hard. x. 584; ad Carol. Calv. ib. 585; ad Hincmar. ib. 588; ad Universos Episcopos Galliæ, ib. 590.

[o] P. 593; Planck, iii. 127-8.

[p] Pp. 588-590.

[q] Planck, iii. 130.

[r] Schröckh, xxii. 152-4; Gfrörer, i. 478-9. Baronius (865. 7), against all reason, contends that the decretals on which Nicolas relied were not the forged but genuine ones. See Pagi in loc., and Planck, iii. 135-7.

[s] See p. 269.

answer, it is inferred that he then knew nothing of the forged collection; and the same was the case in 863, when he spoke of the decretals of Siricius (A.D. 385) as the oldest that were known.[t] But now—only one year later—he is found citing those of the Isidorian collection, and when some of the French bishops questioned them, on the ground that they were not in the code of Dionysius Exiguus, he answered that on the same ground they might question the decretals of Gregory and other popes later than Dionysius, and even the canonical Scriptures; that there were genuine decretals preserved elsewhere; that, as Innocent had ordered all the canonical books to be received, so had Leo ordered the reception of all papal decretals; that they themselves were in the habit of using the epistles in question when favourable to their own interest, and questioned them only when the object was to injure the rights of the apostolical see.[u] It would seem, therefore, that Nicolas had been made acquainted with the forged decretals during Rothad's stay at Rome—most probably by Rothad himself. That Rothad was privy to the forgery appears likely from the facts that he was already a bishop when it was executed, and that he was connected with the party from which it emanated.[x] But we need not suppose that Nicolas knowingly adopted an imposture. The principles of these Decretals had been floating in the mind of the age; on receiving the forgeries he recognised in them his own ideal of ecclesiastical polity, and he welcomed them as affording a historical foundation for it. We may therefore, in charity, at least, acquit him of conscious fraud in this matter, although something of criminality will still attach to the care with which he seems to have avoided all examination of their genuineness,[y] and to the eagerness with which he welcomed these pretended antiquities, coming from a foreign country, whereas, if genuine, they must have all along been known in his own city.

Hincmar made no further active opposition, but acquiesced in the restitution of Rothad, although in his chronicle of the time he speaks of it as effected by might in defiance of rule,[z] and argues that it was inconsistent with the Sardican canon. The act was performed by Arsenius, during the mission which has been men-

[t] Gfrörer, i. 462-3.

[u] Hard. v. 592-3; Planck, iii. 132-4; Gfrörer, i. 479-480.

[x] Gfrörer, i. 483-5.

[y] See Planck, iii. 135-7; Gieseler, II. i. 185; Gfrörer, i. 483-4; and Dean Milman, ii. 379, who seems to think the pope's share in the matter even worse than that of the forger. I do not see that Walter (187) improves the case by saying that Nicolas knew the decretals only through extracts presented to him by French bishops, or even that he never of himself referred to them.

[z] "Non regulariter sed potentialiter." Hincm. Annal. 865, p. 468.

tioned in connexion with the history of Lothair and his wives,[a] and Rothad appears to have died soon after, in the beginning of Adrian's pontificate.[b]

IV. If even Nicolas had found Hincmar a formidable opponent, Adrian was altogether unequal to contend with him.

On the death of Lothair in 869, Charles the Bald immediately seized his dominions. Adrian felt that, after the part which Nicolas and he himself had taken to make the world regard the papal see as the general protector of justice, he was bound to interfere in behalf of the nearer heirs—the emperor Louis, and his uncle the king of Germany.[c] He therefore wrote in terms of strong remonstrance to Charles, to the nobles of Lotharingia, and to the Neustrian bishops;[d] he sent envoys who, during the performance of Divine service at St. Denys, threatened the wrath of St. Peter against the king; and he wrote to Hincmar, blaming him for his supineness, desiring him to oppose his sovereign's ambitious projects, and, if Charles should persist in them, to avoid his communion.[e] As his letters received no answer, he wrote again, threatening, apparently in imitation of Gregory IV., to go into France in person for the redress of the wrong which had been attempted.[f]

Hincmar in the meantime had placed the crown of Lotharingia on the head of Charles,[g] who by the partition of Mersen Sept. 9, 869. had made an accommodation with Louis of Germany, and felt himself independent of the pope. The archbishop took no notice of Adrian's first communication; but he returned a remarkable answer to the second.[h] He disclaimed all judgment of the political question as to inheritance; his king, he says, had required his obedience, and he had felt himself bound to obey. He complains of it as a novel hardship that he should be required to avoid the communion of Charles: the Lotharingian bishops had not been obliged to break off communion with their late sovereign, although he lived in adultery; the popes themselves had not broken off communion with princes who were guilty of crimes, or even of heresy; and Charles had not been convicted of

[a] P. 306.
[b] Anast. 259; Gfrörer, i. 485.
[c] Schröckh, xxii. 169; Planck, iii. 153.
[d] Hard. v. 707, seqq.
[e] Hadr. Ep. 21; Hincm. Opera, ii. 690.
[f] Gfrörer, ii. 30, 35.
[g] See Hincm. Annal. 869, pp. 483-5; and Pertz, Leges, i. 512-5.
[h] Opera, ii. 689, seqq. See Baron. 870. 21, seqq.

any breach of faith which could warrant his bishops in refusing to communicate with him.[i]

But the most striking part of the letter was where Hincmar professed to report the language held by the nobles of Lotharingia—a significant hint of his own opinion, and of the reception which the pope might expect if he were to carry out the line of conduct which he had commenced. He tells Adrian that they contrast his tone towards Charles with the submissiveness of former popes towards Pipin and Charlemagne; they recall to mind the indignities which Gregory IV. had brought on himself by his interference in Frankish affairs; they loudly blame the pope for meddling with politics, and pretending to impose a sovereign on them; they wish him to keep to his own affairs as his predecessors had done, and to defend them by his prayers and by the prayers of the clergy from the Normans and their other enemies; they declare that a bishop who utters unjust excommunications, instead of excluding the objects of them from eternal life, only forfeits his own power of binding.[k]

The pope was greatly incensed. He countenanced a rebellion raised against Charles by one of his sons, Carloman, who had been ordained a deacon; he forbade the French bishops to excommunicate the prince when their sovereign required them to do so.[m] But Hincmar and his brethren, in despite of this, pronounced sentence of degradation and excommunication against Carloman,[n] who, on being taken, was condemned to death, but escaped with the loss of his eyes, and received the abbey of Epternach from the charity of Louis the German.[o] And the pope, after having committed himself by threats and denunciations in a style exaggerated from that of Nicolas, found himself obliged to let these acts of defiance pass without taking any further measures against those who were concerned in them.

V. A yet more remarkable collision arose out of the conduct of Hincmar, bishop of Laon. The archbishop of Rheims had in 858 obtained the see of Laon for his nephew and namesake, who is described as entirely dependent on him for the means of subsistence;[p] but he soon found reason to repent of this step, which

[i] Pp. 691, 694.
[k] Pp. 694-6.
[m] Hadr. Epp. 25-7; Planck, iii. 170.
[n] Hincm. ii. 353-4.
[o] Regino, Ann. 870 (Pertz, i. 583); Planck, iii. 173.
[p] Pagi, xiv. 210; Hard. v. 1306; Hist. Litt. v. 542.

appears, from the younger Hincmar's character, to have been prompted by family or political considerations rather than by a regard for the benefit of the church.[q] The bishop of Laon received from Charles the Bald a distant abbey and an office at court. For these preferments he neglected his diocese; he made himself odious both to clergy and to laity by his exactions; and he treated his uncle's authority as metropolitan with contempt.[r] In consequence of a disagreement with the king, he was tried before a secular court in 868; he was deprived of his civil office, and the income of his see was confiscated.[s] The elder Hincmar, considering that the cause of the church was involved in the matter, came to his support. In a letter to Charles[t] in which, among other authorities, he cites some of the forged decretals,[u] he declared that bishops were amenable to no other judgment than that of their own order; that the trial of a bishop by a secular tribunal was contrary to the ancient laws of the church, to those of the Roman emperors, and to the example of the king's predecessors; that it was a sign that the end of the world was at hand; that royalty is dependent on the episcopal unction, and is forfeited by violation of the engagements made at receiving it.[x] At the diet of Pistres the archbishop maintained his nephew's interest, and the younger Hincmar, on entreating the king's forgiveness, recovered the revenues of his see.[y] A.D. 868.

But fresh disagreements very soon broke out between the kinsmen,[z] and the bishop of Laon involved himself in further troubles by the violence which he used in ejecting a nobleman who was one of the tenants of his church.[a] The king, after citing him to appear, and receiving a refusal, ordered him to be arrested, whereupon he took refuge in a church and placed himself beside the altar.[b] In April 869 he appeared before a synod at Verberie; but he declined its judgment, appealed to the pope, and desired leave to proceed to Rome for the prosecution of his appeal. The permission was refused, and he was committed to prison. Before setting out for Verberie, he had charged his clergy, in case of his detention, to suspend the performance of all divine offices, including

[q] The nephew was probably under the canonical age (Hist. Litt. v. 522). Hincmar attempts to clear himself from a charge of nepotism, Opera, ii. 538. Baronius, in his dislike of the uncle, ventures to justify the nephew, 871. 90-1; 878. 29.

[r] Hincm. ii. 393-5, 584, 597-8.

[s] Hincm. Annal. 868, p. 480.

[t] Opera, ii. 216-233.

[u] P. 227.

[x] Pp. 221-3.

[y] Gfrörer, Karol. ii. 67.

[z] Hincm. ii. 334.

[a] Ib. 601-3.

[b] Hincm. Ann. 869, p. 480.

even baptism, penance, the viaticum of the dying, and the rites of burial, until he should return, or the pope should release them from the injunction.[c] The clergy, in great perplexity and distress, now applied to the archbishop of Rheims for direction in the matter. Hincmar by letter desired his nephew to recall the interdict; on his refusal, he cancelled it by his own authority as metropolitan, and produced ancient authorities to assure the clergy that, as their bishop's "excommunication" was irregular and groundless, they were not bound to obey it.[d]

About the time of Charles's coronation in Lotharingia, the bishop of Laon was set at liberty, his case being referred to a future synod. He forthwith renewed his assaults on his uncle, whom he denounced as the author of his late imprisonment;[e] he espoused the cause of the rebel Carloman; and he sent forth a letter in which he asserted for all bishops a right of appealing to Rome—not against a sentence of their brethren, which was the only kind of appeal hitherto claimed, but in bar of the jurisdiction of local synods.[f] For this claim he alleged the authority of the forged decretals. The archbishop replied, not by denying the genuineness of these documents—which, however he may have suspected it,[g] he was not, after his own use of them, at liberty to impugn—but by maintaining that, as they had been issued on particular occasions, their application was limited to the circumstances which called them forth; that they were only valid in so far as they were agreeable to the ecclesiastical canons, and that some of them had been superseded by the determinations of councils later than their professed date.[h] Such a view of the decretals was even more prejudicial to the new Roman claims than an assertion of their spuriousness would have been.

While Charles was engrossed by the affairs of Lotharingia, the case of the younger Hincmar was postponed. But he was brought before synods at Gondreville and at Attigny in 870, and pamphlets were exchanged between him and his uncle—one, by the archbishop, extending to great length, and divided into 55 chapters.[i] At Attigny the bishop of Laon submitted to swear obedience to the authority of his sovereign and of his metropolitan; and, after having in vain renewed his request for leave to go to Rome, he

[c] Hincm. ii. 510-4.
[d] Ib. 501, 507, 599: Hard. v. 1361, seqq., 1377.
[e] Gfrörer, ii. 71.
[f] The letter is in Hincm. ii. 604.
[g] That he did so is clear from ii. 477.
[h] Opera, ii. 419, 451-2, 482; Gieseler, ii. 1. 186-8.
[i] Opera, ii. 383-595.

asked for a trial by secular judges, who gave a decision in his favour.[k] The elder Hincmar was indignant, both on account of the abandonment of the clerical privileges, in submitting to a lay tribunal, and of the result of the trial.

The bishop was again brought before a synod which met at Doucy in 871. Fresh misdemeanours were laid to his charge—that he had made away with the property of his see, that he had sided with Carloman, and had refused to sign the excommunication which had been uttered against the rebel. It was not until after the third summons that he appeared.[m] He charged the king with having invaded his dignity; the archbishop with having caused his imprisonment; and on these grounds he refused to be judged by them. Charles repelled the charges against himself; he and the nobles who were present swore that the imputation against the archbishop was false.[n] In answer to his claim of a right to appeal to Rome, the bishop was reminded of the canons which ordered that every cause should be terminated in the country where it arose, and was told that he could not appeal until after a trial by the bishops of his own province. He persisted in refusing to answer; but the synod proceeded to examine the matter; and the elder Hincmar, after collecting the opinions of the members, pronounced sentence of deposition against his nephew, reserving only such a power of appeal as was sanctioned by the council of Sardica.[o] The synod then wrote to the pope, stating the grounds of their judgment, and expressing a hope that, in consideration of the bishop's incorrigible misconduct, he would confirm the sentence. They limit the right of appeal agreeably to the Sardican canon, and desire that, if the pope should entertain that which had been made to him, he would commit the further trial of the case to bishops of their own neighbourhood, or would send envoys to sit with the local bishops for the purpose; and that in any case he would not restore Hincmar to his see without a provincial inquiry, but would proceed according to the canons.[p]

Adrian replied in a very lofty tone. He censured the synod for having ventured to depose the accused without regard to his appeal, and ordered them to send him, with some of their own number, to Rome in order to a fresh inquiry.[q] The answer of the Frankish bishops was firm. They professed that they could only account

[k] Opera, ii. 410; Hincm. Annal. 870, p. 487. On these matters, see De Marca, VII. 22, seqq.

[m] Hard. v. 1301. [n] Hard. v. 1308. [o] Hard. v. 1311-7. For the Sardican canon, see vol. i. p. 284.

[p] Hard. v. 1318-1323.

[q] Ep. 28.

for Adrian's letter by supposing that he had not read the documents which they had sent to him; they justified their proceedings, and declared that, if the pope should persist in the course which he had indicated, they were resolved to stand on the rights of their national church.[r]

Adrian's letter to the synod had been accompanied by one in a like strain addressed to Charles, who was greatly provoked by it and employed the elder Hincmar to reply. The archbishop executed his task with hearty zeal.[s] Charles, in whose name the letter was written, tells the pope that the language which he had held was improper to be used towards a king, and unbecoming the modesty of a bishop, and desires him to content himself with writing as his predecessors had written to former sovereigns of France.[t] For a pope to speak of "ordering" a king is a new and unexampled audacity.[u] He denies that Adrian was entitled to evoke the case of the younger Hincmar for trial at Rome. The privileges of St. Peter depend on the exercise of justice; the king will not violate the principles of Scripture and of the church by interposing to defeat justice in a case where the offences of the accused are so many and so clear.[x] He declines with indignation the office which the pope would impose on him by desiring him to look to the property of the see of Laon; the kings of the Franks had hitherto been reckoned lords of the earth—not deputies[y] or bailiffs of bishops. He threatens, if the matter cannot be ended at home, to go to Rome and maintain the rightfulness of his proceedings.[z] The pope had spoken of decrees; but any decree must have been vomited forth from hell which would bind a sovereign.[a] The letter concludes by declaring the king's willingness to abide by the known rules of Scripture, tradition, and the canons, while he is determined to reject "anything which may have been compiled or forged to the contrary by any person"—the plainest intimation that had as yet been given of Hincmar's opinion as to the Isidorian decretals.[b]

Adrian again felt that he had committed a mistake in advancing pretensions which were thus contested; and a league which had just been concluded between Louis the German and his nephew the

[r] Schröckh, xxii. 185; Gfrörer, Karol. ii. 85.
[s] Hincm. ii. 701. seqq.
[t] Pp. 702-4.
[u] Pp. 706-7.
[x] Pp. 709-714.
[y] Vicedomini. See p. 187.
[z] P. 715. Gfrörer (ii. 87) regards this as a threat of leading an army to Rome, but the context is against such an interpretation.
[a] P. 709.
[b] P. 716.

emperor contributed to alarm the pope as to the consequences which might follow from a breach with the king of Neustria.[c] He wrote again to Charles, exchanging his imperious tone for one of soothing and flattery.[d] After some slight allusions to the style of the king's letter, he proceeds (as he says) "to pour in the oil of consolation and the ointment of holy love." He begs that he may not be held accountable for any expressions which might have seemed harsh in his former letters;[e] and, knowing the intensity of the king's desire for additional territory and power, he volunteers an assurance that, if he should live to see a vacancy in the empire, no other candidate than Charles should with his consent be raised to it. The case of the bishop of Laon is treated as of inferior moment; the pope still desires that he may be sent to Rome, but promises that he shall not be restored unless a full inquiry shall have shown the justice of his cause, and that this inquiry shall be held in France.[f] Adrian died before an answer to this letter could be received; and Hincmar was kept in prison, until, by taking part in fresh intrigues, he exposed himself to a severer punishment.[g]

Adrian's conduct in this affair had been imprudent and unfortunate. The French bishops had set aside the false decretals; they had insisted on confining the papal right as to appeals within the limits which had been defined by the council of Sardica; they had denied that the examination of all weightier causes belonged to the pope alone; they had denied that he had the right of evoking a cause before the judgment of a national synod, and would only allow him the power of remitting it for a fresh examination to the bishops of the country in which it arose; and his lofty pretensions had ended in a humiliating concession.[h] Yet the Roman see had gained something. Hincmar, in all his opposition to the Roman claims, carefully mixes up professions of high reverence for its authority; his objections to the decretals, being addressed to his nephew, were not likely to become much known at Rome, while, as he had not openly questioned their genuineness, the popes might henceforth cite them with greater confidence; and a feeling that the power of the papacy was useful to the church restrained him in the midst of his opposition to it. Both bishops and princes now saw in the papacy something which they might use to their advan-

[c] Gfrörer, ii. 87.
[d] Ep. 30; Hard. v. 726.
[e] Col. 727.
[f] Col. 720.
[g] Gfrörer, ii. 88-9.
[h] Planck, iii. 192-4.

tage; and the real benefit of all applications to Rome for aid was sure to redound to the Roman see itself.[l]

A.D. 872. The circumstances of John VIII.'s election as the successor of Adrian are unknown; but he appears to have belonged to the Frankish party among the Roman clergy, and there is no reason to doubt that the emperor consented to his appointment.[k] In 875 the death of the emperor Louis II. without issue opened up to Charles the Bald the great object of his ambition; and the time was now come for the pope to assume the power of disposing of the empire—an assumption countenanced by the fact that his predecessors had long acted as arbiters in the dissensions of the Carolingian princes.[m] Setting aside the stronger hereditary claims of Louis the German, John invited Charles to Rome, and on Christmas-day—seventy-five years after the coronation of Charlemagne—placed the imperial crown on his head. The pope declared that this was in obedience to a revelation which had been made to his predecessor Nicolas.[n] The annalist of Fulda, whose tone towards the "tyrant" of France is generally very bitter, tells us that, in order to obtain the empire, Charles had made a prodigal use of bribery among the senators, "after the fashion of Jugurtha."[o] The pope himself did not fail to benefit on the occasion. A writer of later date[p] is undoubtedly wrong in saying that Charles ceded to him certain territories which are known to have then belonged to the Greek empire; but there is reason to believe that he gave up the control of elections to the papacy, released the pope from the duty of doing homage, and withdrew his resident commissioners from Rome, leaving the government in the hands of the pope, while the title of Defender still served to connect him with the city, and entitled the Romans and their bishops to look to him for aid.[q]

Charles now professed that he owed the empire to John, and during the remainder of his days he was solicitous to serve the

[l] Planck, iii. 199-203.
[k] Gfrörer, ii. 90.
[m] Schröckh, xxii. 196-7.
[n] Gieseler, II. i. 205.
[o] Annal. Fuld. 875, ap. Pertz, i. 389. Cf. Regino, ib. 587-9.
[p] Published by Flacciuś Illyricus, in an appendix to Eutropius. By some he has been placed in the tenth century, but the best authorities refer him to the eleventh (see Schröckh, xxii. 194. seqq.; Planck, iii. 210). Even if the grant were genuine, it would have expired with Charles, as the German kings and emperors had no power to alienate the property of the crown beyond their own lifetime. Pertz, Leges, ii. App. 261.
[q] See the various views of De Marca, Pagi, and Mansi in Baron. xv. 278-281; also Schröckh, xxii. 194; Planck, iii. 218; Gfrörer, ii. 124-5.

author of his dignity.[r] He was crowned as king of Italy at Pavia, in February 876, when the estates declared that, as God, through the vicar of St. Peter and St. Paul, had called him to be emperor, so they *chose* him king.[s] The acts of Pavia were confirmed in an assembly held some months later, at Pontyon, when the Neustrian clergy and nobles professed that they *chose* him for their sovereign, as he had been chosen by the pope and by the Lombards.[t] This change of title from a hereditary to an elective royalty appeared to hold out to the pope a hope of being able to interfere in the future disposal of the Neustrian and Italian kingdoms; but an attempt which was made in his behalf at Pontyon, although zealously supported by the emperor, met with a strenuous opposition from the Frankish clergy. The papal legate, John, bishop of Tusculum, read a letter by which Ansegis, archbishop of Sens, was constituted vicar apostolic and primate of Gaul and Germany, with power to assemble synods, to execute the papal orders by the agency of bishops, and to bring all important matters to Rome for decision.[u] Hincmar and his brethren requested leave to examine the document; to which Charles replied by asking them whether they would obey the pope, and telling them that he, as the pope's *vicar* in the council, was resolved to enforce obedience. He ordered a chair to be set for Ansegis beside the legate; and the archbishop, at his invitation, walked past the metropolitans who were his superiors in dignity, and took his seat in it. But Hincmar and the other bishops behaved with unshaken firmness. They repeated their request that they might be allowed to see the letter and to take a copy of it. They protested against the elevation of Ansegis as uncanonical,—as infringing on the primacy granted to the see of Rheims in the person of Remigius, and on the privileges bestowed on Hincmar by Benedict, Nicolas, and Adrian. They could not be brought to promise obedience to the pope except such as was agreeable to the canons, and to the example of their predecessors. One bishop only—Frotarius—was disposed to comply, in the hope of obtaining a translation from the diocese of Bordeaux, which had been desolated by the Northmen, to that of Bourges;[x] but his brethren objected to the translation as contrary to the canons.[y] The emperor, provoked by Hincmar's opposition, re-

[r] Schröckh, xxii. 198-201; Planck, iii. 218-9.

[s] Pertz, Leges, i. 529.

[t] Ibid. 533.

[u] Joh. Ep. 134, ap. Hard. vi. 105. The dignity was to be personal, not attached to the see of Sens. Thomassin, I. i. 33-4.

[x] See p. 276.

[y] Hinc. ii. 732-5; Annal. 876, pp. 499, seqq.; Pertz, Leges, i. 533; Hard. vi. 166; Planck, iii. 233.

quired him to take a new oath of fealty in the presence of the assembly, as if his loyalty were suspected—an unworthy return for the archbishop's long, able, and zealous exertions for the rights of the crown and of the national church.[z] The council broke up without coming to any satisfactory determination. Hincmar produced a strong defence[a] of the rights of metropolitans against the new principles on which the commission to Ansegis was grounded. Charles was induced by political reasons to act in a spirit of conciliation,[b] and the pope got over the difficulty as to Ansegis by conferring the primacy of Gaul on the see of Arles, to which it had been attached before the Frankish conquest. But amid the commotions of the time this arrangement had no practical effect.[c]

In the mean time the pope was greatly disquieted at home by the factions of his city, by the petty princes and nobles of the neighbourhood, and by the Saracens, who, since the death of Louis II., carried on their ravages without any effectual check.[d] Sometimes the nobles made alliance with the enemies of Christendom. Naples, Gaeta, Amalfi, and Sorrento, after having suffered much at their hands, entered into a league with them, and united with them in the work of devastation and plunder.[e] Sergius, duke of Naples, made frequent incursions into the papal territory, and John, after having in vain employed gentler means, uttered an anathema against him. On this the duke's brother, Athanasius, bishop of Naples, took on himself the execution of the sentence, seized Sergius, put out his eyes, and sent him to the pope, who requited the bishop with a profusion of thanks and commendations—quoting the texts of Scripture which enjoin a preference of the Saviour over the dearest natural affections.[f] Athanasius now annexed the dukedom to his spiritual office. But he soon discovered that he was unable to cope with the Saracens, whereupon he allied himself with them, harassed the pope after the same fashion as his brother, and obliged John to buy him off with a large sum of money, in consideration of which he promised to break off his connexion with the infidels. But the promise was not fulfilled, and John with a Roman synod, in 881, uttered an anathema against the duke-bishop.[g] John implored the emperor

Nov. 877.

[z] Hincm. ii. 834; Hard. vi. 177.
[a] Opera, ii. 719, seqq.
[b] Gfrörer, ii. 130.
[c] Hard. vi. 30-2; De Marca, VI. xxix. 5; Planck, iii. 233-40.
[d] Baron. 876. 33; Milman, ii. 396-9.
[e] Gfrörer, ii. 139.
[f] Baron. 877. 3. The cardinal's justification of the pope for praising this "indecens episcopo factum" is curious. Hardouin omits the letter.
[g] Joh. VIII. Epp. 113, 116, 126, ap. Hard. vi.; Erchempert ap. Pertz, iii. 254-5; Chron. Salern. ib. 53[5], seqq.;

to come to his assistance against the enemies by whom he was beset. Charles was disposed to comply with the entreaty; but the unwillingness of his nobles to consent to such an expedition may be inferred from the heavy price which he paid for their concurrence, by allowing the office of the counts to be converted into an hereditary dignity at the council of Kiersy in 877.[h] The pope, on being informed of his protector's approach, set out to meet him, and on the way held a council at Ravenna, where he passed some canons by which, in accordance with the pseudoisidorian principles, the power of bishops was exalted while that of metropolitans was depressed.[i] He met the emperor at Vercelli, and proceeded in his company to Tortona, where Richildis, the wife of Charles, was crowned as empress.[k] But Charles retired before the advancing force of Carloman, who in the preceding year had succeeded his father Louis the German; and he died in a hut on the pass of Mont Cenis.[m] The concessions which he had made both to Rome and to his nobles had greatly weakened the power of the Frankish crown, and the policy which he had lately followed in ecclesiastical affairs was very dangerous to the rights of the national church. Yet although, for the sake of his private objects, he had in his latter days behaved with much obsequiousness to the pope, it is clear that he had no intention of allowing the principles of the decretals to be established in their fullness within his dominions north of the Alps.[n]

Aug. 877.

After the death of Charles, the empire was vacant until 884. The pope, finding himself continually annoyed by Lambert, marquis of Spoleto, and other partisans of the German Carolingians,[o] declared his intention of seeking aid in France,[p] and, after some forcible detention, which he avenged by anathemas against Lambert and Adalbert of Tuscany,[q] he embarked on board ship, and landed at Genoa.[r] The reception which he at first met with in France was not encouraging. He had offended the clergy by his attempts against the national church, and especially by the commission to Ansegis; while all classes were irritated on account of the costly and fruitless expedition which he had induced

A.D. 878.

Baron. 881. 1-4. He afterwards absolved Athanasius, provided he had separated from the infidels, and had taken or slain their chiefs. A.D. 881-2. Jaffé, 290.

[h] C. 9. See above, p. 278.

[i] Hard. vi. 185, seqq.

[k] Hincm. Ann. 877, p. 503.

[m] Ib. p. 504; Regino, p. 589.

[n] See Gieseler, II. i. 207-8.

[o] Ep. ad Lud. Bav. regis filium. Hard. vi. 27.

[p] Ad Lud. Balbum, ib. 25.

[q] Ib. 29.

[r] Baron. 878. 14.

the late sovereign to undertake.[s] John wrote letters to all the Frankish princes,[t] urgently summoning them and their bishops to attend a council at Troyes; but the bishops of Gaul only appeared, and the only sovereign present was the king of France, Louis the Stammerer, who at first had been detained by illness.[u] Here, as at Ravenna, the pope proposed and passed some canons which raised the episcopal privileges to a height before unknown, and he dealt about anathemas with his usual profusion.[x] The bishops joined with him in condemning Adalbert, Lambert, and his other Italian enemies, and in return obtained from him a sentence against the invaders of their own property.[y] But they resolutely stood out for their national rights, insisting on the Sardican canon which limited the power of the Roman see as to appeals, and on those ancient laws of the church which forbade translations such as that of Frotarius.[z] And when the pope produced a grant of Charles the Bald, bestowing the abbey of St. Denys on the Roman see, they met him with a positive denial that the king could alienate the possessions of the crown.[a]

Sept. 14.

John was greatly provoked by Hincmar's steady resistance to the pretensions of Rome; and some of the archbishop's enemies now took advantage of this feeling to annoy him by bringing forward his nephew, who, after having been imprisoned and banished, had at last been blinded by order of Charles on account of his connexion with an invasion from the side of Germany.[b] The unfortunate man was led into the place of assembly, and petitioned for a restoration to his see. But the pope, besides that he may have been afraid to venture on a step so offensive to the metropolitan of Rheims, was restrained by the circumstance that he had confirmed the deposition of the younger Hincmar, and had consecrated his successor, Hildemulf.[c] He therefore only in so far favoured the petition as to give the deposed bishop leave to sing mass, and to assign him a pension out of the revenues of Laon, while he refused to accept the resignation of Hildemulf, who alleged that his health disqualified him for the performance of his duties. The enemies of the elder Hincmar, however, were resolved to make the most of the matter as a triumph over him; they arrayed the blind man in

[s] Gfrörer, ii. 185.
[t] Hard. vi. 36, seqq.
[u] Hincm. Annal. p. 506; Conc. Tricass. II. ap. Hard. vi. 191, seqq.
[x] See as to his fondness for this, Schmidt, i. 683-4; Milman, ii. 398.
[y] Hincm. Annal. pp. 506-7.
[z] Hincm. Annal. p. 507.
[a] Ib. 508.
[b] Gfrörer, ii. 189.
[c] Schröckh, xxii. 190.

episcopal robes, and, after having with great ceremony presented him to the pope, led him into the cathedral, where he bestowed his benediction on the people.[d] A week before the opening of the council, the pope had again crowned Louis, but he refused to crown the queen, on account of an irregularity in her marriage. It does not appear what answer he obtained to his request for assistance; but it is certain that no assistance was sent.[e]

John had conceived the idea of carrying his claim to the power of bestowing the empire yet further by choosing a person whose elevation should be manifestly due to the papal favour alone—Boso, viceroy of Provence, who had gained his friendship on occasion of his visit to France. The project, however, was found impossible, nor was the pope more successful in his attempts to secure the kingdom of Italy for his candidate.[f] But on the death of Louis the Stammerer, Boso was chosen by a party of bishops and nobles as king of Provence—a newly-formed sovereignty; and the pope's support contributed to his election.[g] John died in December 882; it is said that some of his own relations administered poison to him, and, finding that it did not work speedily, knocked out his brains with a mallet.[h]

In the same month with him died the great champion of the Frankish church. Towards the end of his life he had had a serious dispute with Louis III. as to the appointment of a bishop to Beauvais.[i] In answer to the king's profession of contempt for a subject who attempted to interfere with his honour, Hincmar used very strong language as to the relations of the episcopal and the royal powers. He tells him that bishops may ordain kings, but kings cannot consecrate bishops; and that the successors of the Apostles must not be spoken of as *subjects*. "As the Lord said, 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,' so may I say in my degree, 'You have not chosen me to the prelacy of the church, but I, with my colleagues and the other faithful ones of God, have chosen you to be governor of the kingdom, under the condition of duly keeping the laws."[k] Hincmar was at length compelled to leave his city by the approach of the Northmen. He set out in a litter, carrying with him the relics of St. Remigius,[m] and died at Epernay, on the 21st of December. The Annals of

[d] Hincm. Annal. p. 508.
[e] Gfrörer, ii. 187.
[f] Sismondi, iii. 238-9.
[g] Pertz, Leges, i. 547; Planck, iii. 231.
[h] Annal. Fuld. A.D. 882; Milman, ii. 406.
[i] See his excommunication of the king's nominee, Opera, ii. 811.
[k] Opera, ii. 198-9.
[m] Hincm. Annal. p. 515.

St. Bertin, which are the most valuable record of the period, are supposed to have been written by him from the year 861 to within a month of his death.[n]

The first and second successors of John in the papacy, Marinus (A.D. 882) and Adrian III. (A.D. 884) appear to have been chosen without the imperial licence, and by means of the German interest.[o] On the death of Adrian, which took place as he was on his way to Germany in 885,[p] Stephen V. was consecrated without reference to the emperor, Charles the Fat; but Charles expressed great indignation at the omission, and had already taken measures for deposing the pope, when Stephen succeeded in appeasing him by sending a legate with a long list of bishops, clergy, and laymen of rank who had taken part in the election.[q]

Charles the Fat, son of Louis the German, had received the imperial crown from John VIII. in 881,[r] and had gradually become master of the whole Carolingian empire. But his reign was disastrous; in 887 he was deposed by Arnulph, an illegitimate son of his brother Carloman; and, after having been supported for some months by alms, he died in the following year—whether of disease or by violence is uncertain.[s] The popular feeling as to this unfortunate prince, the last legitimate descendant of Charlemagne, may be inferred from the tone in which he is spoken of by the annalists of the time. They dwell on his virtues and amiable qualities; they express a trust that the sufferings which he patiently bore in this world may be found to have prepared his way to a better inheritance; it is even said that at his death heaven was seen to open, and to receive his soul.[t]

[n] Pertz, i. 420-1; Gfrörer, i. 243-4.

[o] Schröckh, xxii. 221-2; Gfrörer, ii. 252. On a story that Adrian obtained the removal of the imperial control in elections to the papacy, and an engagement that no one but an Italian should thenceforth be king of Italy, see Gfrörer, ii. 271-2.

[p] Annal. Fuld. 885, ap. Pertz, i. 402.

[q] Ibid.

[r] Herm. Contract. ap. Pertz, v. 108.

[s] See Annal. Vedast. A.D. 887, ap. Pertz, i. 525; Pagi, xv. 534; Mansi, ib.

[t] Annal. Fuld. ap. Pertz, i. 405; Annal. Vedast. ib. 525; Regino, ib. 597-8.

CHAPTER III.

THE GREEK CHURCH — PHOTIUS.

A.D. 842-898.

MICHAEL III., the son of Theophilus and Theodora, grew up under evil influences. His maternal uncle Bardas founded schemes of ambition on the corruption of the young prince's character. He removed one of the male guardians by death, and another by compelling him to retire into a monastery; and by means of a worthless tutor, as well as by his own discourse, he instilled into the emperor a jealous impatience of the control of his mother and sister.[a] At the age of eighteen Michael threw off this yoke. Theodora called together the senate, showed them the treasures which her economy had amassed,[b] in order that she might not be afterwards suspected of having left her son without ample provision, resigned her share in the regency, and withdrew from the palace.[c]

Michael now gave the loose to his depraved tastes and appetites. His chosen associates were athletes, charioteers, musicians, buffoons, and dancing-girls. He himself entered the lists in the public chariot races, and insisted on receiving his prizes from the hand of an image. He joined in the feasts and drinking-bouts of his companions; he became sponsor for their children, and on such occasions bestowed lavish presents; he rewarded acts of disgusting buffoonery with costly gifts, and even encouraged his vile favourites to practise their gross and brutal jests on his mother. The wealth which he had inherited was soon dissipated; he was reduced to melt down his plate, and even the golden tissues of the imperial robes.[d]

The most outrageous of Michael's extravagances was his profane mimicry of religion. He organised a mock hierarchy, of which one Theophilus, who was known by the name of Gryllus,[e] was the chief. Under this patriarch were twelve suffragans, the emperor himself being one of the number. They went through a farcical ordina-

[a] Schlosser, 555, 568-71.

[b] Mr. Finlay reckons them at 574-7. 4,250,000*l.* ii. 203.

[c] Cedrenus, 542-4.

[d] Cedren. 544, 552-4; Schlosser,

[e] Γρύλλος, a sucking-pig.

tion; they were arrayed in costly robes imitated from those of the church; they sang obscene songs to music composed in ridicule of the ecclesiastical chant; they burlesqued the condemnations and depositions of bishops; they had jewelled plate, with which they administered an eucharist of mustard and vinegar.[f] On one occasion this ribald crew encountered the venerable patriarch Ignatius in the streets, when Gryllus rudely jostled him, the attendant mummers twanged their harps in derision, insulted the patriarch with filthy language, and beat the clergy of his train.[g] After the death of their patron, some of the wretches who had shared in these abominations were called to account before the great council of 869, when they pleaded that they had acted through fear of the emperor, and expressed contrition for their offences.[h]

During the course of ages, a change had come over the characters which had formerly distinguished the Greek and the Latin churches respectively. Among the Greeks the fondness for speculation had been succeeded by a settled formalism, while the old rigidity of the Latins had yielded to the new life infused by the accession of the barbarian nations to the church.[i] But, although different from that of earlier times, a marked distinction still existed. The influence of Augustine, which had so largely moulded the western mind, and had given prominence to the doctrines of grace above all others, had not extended to the east. From the time of the Trullan council, the churches had been divided by a diversity of usages, especially as to the marriage of the clergy: and, although the question as to the procession of the Holy Ghost had been got over in the days of Charlemagne, it still remained as a doctrinal centre around which other causes of discord might array themselves. The see of Rome had gradually risen to a height far above its ancient rival; and, while Constantinople could not look on this change with satisfaction, there was on the Roman side a wish to make the superiority felt. Political jealousies also contributed to feed the smouldering ill feeling which any accident might fan into a flame.[k] And now a personal question produced a dissension which tended far towards the eventual separation of the churches.

Nicetas, a son of Michael Rhangabe, had, on his father's deposition, been thrust into a cloister at the age of fourteen.[m] He

[f] Conc. Cpol. IV. ap. Hard. v. 893, 906; Vit. Ignatii, ib. 973; Cedren. 553-4.

[g] Cedren. 554.

[h] Hard. v. 893, 905-6.

[i] Neander, vi. 293; Gieseler, II. i. 139-140; Döllinger, i. 380.

[k] Schröckh, xxiv. 127; Neander, vi. 294.

[m] Vit. Ignatii by Nicetas David, in Hardouin, v. 945. On this part of the history there is much valuable informa-

assumed the name of Ignatius, became a priest; acquired a high character for piety, and in 846 was promoted by Theodora to the see of Constantinople, on the recommendation of a famous hermit.[n] The late patriarch, Methodius, had been engaged in differences with Gregory bishop of Syracuse, who usually lived at Constantinople, and had uttered an anathema against him. In Ignatius the feeling of religious antagonism could hardly fail to be stimulated by the fact that Gregory was a son of Leo the Armenian, by whom his own father had been dethroned.[o] He refused Gregory's assistance at his consecration; in 851 he deposed and excommunicated him for having uncanonically ordained a person of another diocese; and at the patriarch's request the sentence was confirmed by a Roman synod under Benedict III.[p] The inhabitants of the capital were divided between Ignatius and Gregory; but, although the opposition to the patriarch was strong, he earned high and deserved credit by his conduct as a pastor.[q]

His conscientious zeal for the duties of his office induced him to remonstrate with Bardas on the subject of a scandalous imputation —that, after having divorced his wife, he lived in an incestuous intercourse with the widow of his son;[r] and, finding remonstrance ineffectual, the patriarch proceeded so far as to refuse the holy eucharist to the minister at Epiphany 857. Bardas, whose influence over his nephew was continually increasing, resolved on vengeance. He persuaded Michael that, in order to the security of his power, it would be expedient to compel Theodora and her daughters to become nuns, and Ignatius was summoned to officiate at their profession. He refused, on the ground that it would be a violation of his duty towards the empress and one of her daughters, who had been appointed regents by the will of Theophilus. On this Bardas accused him of treason, adding a charge of connexion with the interest of a crazy pretender to the throne named Gebon; and the patriarch was banished to the island of Terebinthus.[s]

Bardas resolved to fill the vacant throne with a man whose brilliant reputation might overpower the murmurs excited by the

tion in some papers contributed to the British Magazine by the Rev. J. G. Dowling, but unfortunately left incomplete at his death.

[n] Vita, 949-953; Cedren. 551; Pagi, xiv. 357.

[o] Finlay, ii. 208.

[p] Vit. Ign. ap. Hard. 961; Nicol. Ep. vii. ib. 139; Baron. 854. 7 and the notes; Dowling in Brit. Mag. xvii. 604-5.

[q] Brit. Mag. xvii. 605.

[r] Vit. Ign. 956; Schröckh, xxiv. 129.

[s] Ignat. Ep. ad Nicol. ap. Hard. 1013; Vita, ib. 956-7; Anastas. ad Hadrian. ib. 770; Pagi, xiv. 490; Schlosser, 606. Schlosser, Neander, and Mr. Finlay (ii. 207) place the affair as to Theodora before the quarrel with Bardas; but I have followed Mr. Dowling, Brit. Mag. xvii. 606.

deprivation of Ignatius. Photius was a member of a distinguished Byzantine family, a great-nephew of the patriarch Tarasius, and connected with the imperial house by the marriage of his brother to a sister of Theodora. He had lived in the enjoyment of wealth and splendour; he had been ambassador to the caliph of Bagdad, and was now secretary of state and captain of the guards. But in the midst of his occupations he had acquired an amount of learning so far surpassing that of his contemporaries that his enemies even referred it to unhallowed sources.[t] He had been accustomed to carry on a part of his studies in company with his brother Tarasius, and, on setting out for Bagdad, presented him with another companion, in the shape of a summary of books which he had read by himself.[u] This work—the *Myriobiblon* or *Bibliotheca*—contains notices of two hundred and eighty books in classical and ecclesiastical literature, with abridgments, extracts, and comments; and, in addition to its value as a treasury of much which would otherwise have perished, it is remarkable in the history of literature as the prototype of our modern critical reviews.[x] Among his other writings are a Dictionary; letters, of which many were written in answer to questions in Theology; and a collection of ecclesiastical laws.[y]

With the exception of such information as may be gathered from his own works, our knowledge of Photius comes almost exclusively from his adversaries.[z] The enmity of these in his own time was bitter; and his name has since been pursued by writers in the papal interest with a rancour which can perhaps only be paralleled by their treatment of the Protestant reformers. The biographer of Ignatius tells us that the intruding patriarch took part in Michael's drinking bouts, and made no scruple of associating with Gryllus and his gang;[a] and another Greek writer states that on one occasion, when the emperor was overcome by fifty cups, Photius drank sixty without any appearance of intoxication;[b] but, if there was

[t] Vit. Igna. 960; Cedren. 545; Schlosser, 607.

[u] Bibliotheca, p. 1, ed. Hoeschel, Rothomag. 1653. Mr. Dowling (Brit. Mag. xvii. 267) exposes the mistake of Dupin (vii. 103) and Gibbon (v. 267), who suppose the work to have been written during the embassy, and marvel how Photius could have procured the books. But the story told by Photius himself—that he hastily dictated the Bibliotheca to an amanuensis amidst the bustle of preparation for his departure—taxes our belief very severely. It is more probable that the notes were before made, and only required arrangement; or perhaps the whole account of the origin of the book may be merely an example of a common literary artifice.

[x] Schröckh, xxi. 196.

[y] Ib. 196-8.

[z] Dowling, in B. M. xvii. 9.

[a] Hard. v. 976.

[b] Symeon Magister, quoted by Dowling, in B. M. xvii. 261. Mr. Dowling observes that Symeon tells other manifest fables which destroy the credit of this story.

ever any foundation for this tale, the feat must have been before his consecration, since it is impossible that so prudent a man would, for the sake of influence over the depraved young prince, have risked the scandal of such a compliance when patriarch. Even his enemies admit that (although, as they think, undeservedly) he had gained a character for sanctity.[c] Nor was his orthodoxy as yet impeached, although he was afterwards called in question for having taught that man has a reasonable and also a spiritual soul —an opinion countenanced by the authority of many among the earlier fathers.[d] Like Ignatius, he was a supporter of the cause of images, for which he states that his parents had suffered in the times of persecution.[e]

Attempts were made to induce Ignatius to resign his dignity; but, as such a step would have involved an acknowledgment of guilt, he steadfastly withstood both entreaties and severities.[f] At length, however, he was drawn into something which the court could regard as a compliance; and Photius was in six successive days ordained by Gregory of Syracuse through all the degrees of the ministry. He was consecrated on Christmas-eve, and on the following day appeared as patriarch, and gave his benediction to the people.[g] He repeatedly declares, even in letters to Bardas himself, that the promotion was forced on him, and tells the pope that he was imprisoned before he would accept it.[h] Nor need we suppose his reluctance insincere; for even an ambitious man (as Photius certainly was) might well have hesitated to encounter the difficulties of a position which was to be held to the exclusion of such a prelate as Ignatius, and by the favour of such patrons as Bardas and

[c] Dowling, xvii. 607.

[d] Schlosser, 608; Neander, vi. 301. It was condemned by the council of 869-70. Can. 10 in the Greek, or 11 in the Latin. Hard. v. 903, 1101.

[e] It has been said that he speaks of his parents as having been martyrs for the sake of images; but this seems to have arisen from a confusion of two passages, in one of which he speaks of their sufferings in that cause (Ep. 113), while in the other he says that they died early, and were adorned with "the martyr's crown of patience" (Ep. 234, p. 349). There is a remarkable letter (64) in which he answers an objection made by the iconomachists of his time — that, since every nation had a different representation of the Saviour, there could be no genuine one. Photius replies that it might as well be argued from the variety of translations that there was no original Gospel; or from the different representations of the cross, that there was no true cross; or from ritual and liturgical varieties, an objection might be taken to the Eucharist altogether; or, as every nation supposed the Saviour to have been incarnate in its own likeness, the story of the incarnation might be rejected. Thus, as Neander remarks (vi. 288), he did not believe in the existence of any authentic original likeness, but regarded the unity of ideal which lay under the various representations.

[f] Vita, 957; Schlosser, 594.

[g] Vit. Ign. 961-2; Dowling, in Brit. Mag. xvii. 606.

[h] Epp. 3, 6, ad Bardam; ed. Ric. Montacut. (Mountagu, bishop of Norwich), Lond. 1651; Ep. ad Nicol. ap. Baron. 861. 36; Hard. vi. 253. See Schröckh, xxi. 194; Dowling, xvii. 609.

Michael; while in mitigation of the unseemliness of intruding into the place of a patriarch who was still alive, and whose resignation was only constructive, it is to be considered that Photius had belonged to the party of Gregory, and therefore could have had little personal scruple as to the rights of Ignatius.[i]

It is said that he was required by the metropolitans of his patriarchate to swear that he would honour the deprived patriarch as a father,[k] and that he obtained from Bardas a promise that Ignatius should be kindly treated.[m] But he very soon had the mortification of finding that this promise was disregarded. Ignatius, in the hope of forcing him to a more explicit resignation, was exposed to cold and nakedness, was scourged, chained in a gloomy dungeon, and deprived of the consolation which he might have received from the visits of his friends, while many of his partisans were beaten, imprisoned, and mutilated with the usual Byzantine cruelty;[n] and Photius had to bear the odium of outrages committed in violation of the pledge which he had required, and in contempt of his earnest remonstrances and entreaties.[o]

The adherents of Ignatius were zealous and resolute. They held a synod, at which Photius was excommunicated; whereupon the patriarch, who appears from the bitterness of his letters to have been of a very irritable temper, retaliated by assembling another synod, and uttering a like sentence against Ignatius.[p] In order to strengthen his position, he now sent a notice of his consecration to Rome, with a request that the pope would depute legates to a council which was to be held at Constantinople for the suppression of the iconoclast party, which had again attempted to make head. His letter was accompanied by one from the emperor, with splendid gifts to the apostolic see. The application for aid against the iconoclasts appears to have been merely a pretext[q] —the real object being to draw the pope into the interest of Photius. In the mean time renewed attempts were made to obtain the resignation of Ignatius, at first by an increase of severity against him and his party, and afterwards by allowing him to return to Constantinople and offering the restoration of his property.[r]

[i] See Schröckh, xxiv. 132; Fleury, l. 3; Neander, vi. 302; Dowling, xvii. 609.

[k] Vit. Ign. 961.

[m] Brit. Mag. xvii. 609.

[n] Ign. ad Nicol. ap. Hard. v. 1013; Vita, ib. 964.

[o] Phot. Epp. 3, 6, ad Bardam.

[p] Vit. Ign. 964. The acts are lost, but the sentence was probably rested on the ground of uncanonical election and political offences. Schlosser, 603; Dowling, xviii. 243-6.

[q] The biographer of Ignatius speaks of it as such, 964.

[r] Vita, 964; Schlosser, 603-4. Mr. Dowling thinks that, as Ignatius was already deposed, the renewed severities

Nicolas had just been raised to the papal chair. He was no doubt better informed as to the late events at Constantinople than the patriarch or the emperor supposed;[s] he saw in their application to him an opportunity of extending his influence, and appeared to regard it as a reference of the case to his decision. He wrote to the emperor in the style of an independent sovereign, and—as a hint of the price which he set on his co-operation[t]—he insisted on the restoration of the provinces which had been withdrawn from his jurisdiction, and of the patrimony of the church in Calabria and Sicily.[u] On the principles of the false decretals, he expressed surprise that a synod should have been held for the deposition of Ignatius without permission from Rome; nor did he fail to remark on the inconsistency, that, while Photius represented his predecessor as having resigned from age and infirmity,[x] the emperor spoke of him as having been deposed. Two bishops, Rodoald of Portus, and Zacharias of Anagni, were sent to Constantinople as legates, with instructions to inquire into the matter, and not to admit Photius to communion except as a layman.[y] They were charged with a short letter to the patriarch, in which the pope remarked on his hasty ordination, but told him that, if the legates should make a favourable report, he would gladly own him as a brother.[z] A.D. 860.

Michael, provoked by the tone of the pope's reply, received the legates with dishonour. They were detained at Constantinople for months, and were plied with threats and with bribery, which did not fail of their effect.[a] At length a synod, styled by the Greeks "the first and second,"[b] and consisting, like the Nicene council, of three hundred and eighteen bishops, met in 861. Photius was recognised as patriarch. The letter from the pope was read, but with the omission of such parts as were likely to give offence[c]—whether it were that the legates had consented to the suppression, or that advantage was taken of their ignorance of Greek. Ignatius

were not meant to extort a resignation, but the withdrawal of his protest against Photius (Brit. Mag. xviii. 243). But it seems more likely that the resignation was desired in order that the opposite party might be cleared *elsewhere*.

[s] Milman, ii. 359.

[t] Dowling, xviii. 373.

[u] Ep. 2, ap. Hard. v. 121-6.

[x] Vit. Ign. 964.

[y] Nic. Ep. 1, Hard. v. 120.

[z] Ep. 3.

[a] Nic. Ep. 10.

[b] One explanation of the name is, that, having been obliged by an outbreak of the iconoclasts to break off its sessions, it afterwards resumed them. (Zonaras, ap. Hard. vi. 1196; Schröckh, xxiv. 136.) Mr. Dowling prefers that proposed by Hody, that, having been employed on two distinct subjects—the iconoclastic question, and that between Photius and Ignatius—its proceedings were recorded in two separate tomes. xviii. 376.

[c] Anastas. ap. Hard. v. 751; Schlosser, 606; Dowling, xviii. 374.

was brought before the assembly, and was required to subscribe his own condemnation. He behaved with inflexible spirit, desired the legates to remove the "adulterer," if they wished to appear as judges, and told them to their face that they had been bribed.[d] Seventy-two witnesses—a few of them senators and patricians, but for the most part persons of low condition, farriers, ostlers, needle-makers, and the like, while some are described as heretics[e]—were brought forward to sign a paper asserting that he had been promoted by imperial favour, and without canonical election.[f] He was stripped of the patriarchal robes, in which, as the matter was left to his own judgment, he had thought it his duty to appear;[g] he was beaten, and, at last, when exhausted by ill treatment for more than a fortnight, was made, by forcibly holding his hand, to sign with a cross a confession that he had obtained his office irregularly and had administered it tyrannically.[h] He was told that he must read this document publicly at Whitsuntide, and threats of losing his eyes and his hands were uttered; but he contrived to escape in the disguise of a slave, and found a refuge among the monks of the islands from the search which Bardas caused to be made for him.[i] An earthquake was interpreted as a witness from heaven in his favour, while Photius, by offering another explanation of it, drew on himself a charge of impiety.[k] Bardas, in deference to the general feeling, now permitted the deposed patriarch to return to a monastery in the capital,[m] while Michael jested on the state of affairs by saying that Gryllus was his own patriarch, Ignatius the patriarch of the Christians, and Photius the patriarch of Bardas.[n]

The acts of the council were sent to Nicolas with a request from the emperor that he would confirm them. At the same time Photius addressed to the pope a letter which, by the skill displayed in its composition, has extorted the unwilling admiration of Baronius.[o] He professes to deplore in a pathetic strain the elevation which he represents as having been forced on him; the pope, he says, ought rather to pity than to blame him for having exchanged a life of peace, content, and general esteem for a post of danger, anxiety, unpopularity, and envy.[p] As for the ecclesiastical laws which

[d] Hard. v. 1016; Vita, 965.

[e] Vit. Ign. 965; Hard. v. 891, 1096.

[f] His biographer says that he had been duly chosen by the people and the bishops, and that the charge might more fitly have been brought against Photius. 968.

[g] Vita, 965.

[h] Ib. 969.

[i] Ib. 672; Schlosser, 607.

[k] Vita, 972; Schlosser, 608.

[m] Vita, 972.

[n] Ibid. 973.

[o] 861. 33, 55. He gives it in a translation, 34-54.

[p] Bar. 861. 36-9.

Nicolas had spoken of in his letters,—*i. e.* the forged decretals—they were not known at Constantinople. The rule which forbade such ordinations as his was not binding, inasmuch as it had not been sanctioned by a general council; he defends his ordination by the parallel cases of his predecessors Nicephorus and Tarasius, who had been promoted from the laity, and by the stronger cases of Ambrose in the west and of Nectarius in the east, who had been chosen to the episcopate while yet unbaptised.[q] He had, he says, sanctioned in the late synod a canon against the elevation of a layman to a bishoprick except by regular degrees; and he expresses a wish that the church of Constantinople had before observed the rule, as in that case he would have escaped the troubles which had come on him.[r] His tone throughout, although respectful, is that of an equal. In conclusion he reflects with bitter irony on the morals of the Romans, and prays that Rome may no longer continue to be a harbour for worthless persons such as those whom it had lately received without letters of communion—adulterers, thieves, drunkards, oppressors, murderers, and votaries of all uncleanness, who had run away from Constantinople in fear of punishment for their vices.[s] By this description were intended the refugees of the Ignatian party.

But the Ignatians had also conveyed to the pope their version of the late events, and Nicolas wrote in a lofty tone both to the emperor and to the patriarch.[t] The Roman church, he says, is the head of all, and on it all depend.[u] He sets aside the parallels which Photius had alleged for his consecration, on the ground that the persons in question had not intruded into the room of wrongfully ejected orthodox bishops.[x] He tells Photius that, if he did not know the laws of the church, it was because they made against his cause.[y] At a synod held in 863, the pope deposed and excommunicated Zacharias for misconduct in his legation, reserving the case of Rodoald, who was then employed on a mission in France;[z] he declared Photius to be deprived of all spiritual office and dignity, and threatened that, in case of his disobedience, he should be excommunicated without hope of restoration until on his deathbed; he annulled all orders conferred by him, and threatened his consecrators and abettors with excommunication. All proceedings against Ignatius were declared to be void, and it was

[q] § 42-47.
[r] § 48-9.
[s] § 54.
[t] Ep. 5, ap. Hard. v. 129; Ep. 6, ib. 132.
[u] Ib. 133.
[x] Ib. 130-1, 133, 135.
[y] Ib. 135.
[z] Ep. 7; ib. 137. See p. 303.

required that he should be acknowledged as patriarch. The pope embodied the resolutions of this council in a letter to the emperor;[a] and he desired the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem to make it known that the Roman church in no way consented to the usurpation of Photius.[b]

Michael replied in violent indignation, that by his application to the pope he had not intended to acknowledge him as a judge, or to imply that his own clergy were not sufficient for the decision of the case, and he scoffed at Rome as antiquated, and at the Latin language as a barbarous jargon.[c] Nicolas, who was elated by his recent triumph over Lothair, met the emperor with no less haughtiness.[d] He taxes him with disrespect towards God's priests, and, as Michael had spoken of having "ordered" him to send legates to the council, he tells him that such language is not to be used to the successors of St. Peter.[e] To the emperor's reflections on the Latin tongue, he answers that such words, uttered in the "excess of madness," were injurious to Him who made all languages, and were ridiculous as coming from one who styled himself emperor of the Romans.[f] He insists at great length on the privileges of the Roman see, derived not from councils, but from the chief of the Apostles.[g] He utters many threats against all who shall take part against Ignatius.[h] He proposes that the rival patriarchs, or their representatives, should appear at Rome for a trial of the cause.[i] He warns the emperor to abstain from interfering with spiritual things,[k] and desires him to burn his late letter, threatening that otherwise he will himself suspend it to a stake, and, to the disgrace of the writer, will burn it in the sight of all the nations which are at Rome;[m] and he invokes curses on the person who is to read his letters to the emperor, if he should in any respect mutilate or mistranslate them.[n] He sent the acts of the

[a] Ep. 7.

[b] Ep. 4. ap. Hard. v. 127.

[c] Nicol. ap. Hard. v. 161. The emperor's own letter is lost.

[d] Epp. 8, 9 (May 865; Nov. 866); Hard. v. 144-196.

[e] Coll. 147-8. [f] C. 148-9.

[g] Coll. 162-3. In one of the letters to Michael (Ep. 8. col. 159), the ninth canon of Chalcedon, which in earlier times had been regarded as an offence against Rome, is, by an extraordinary interpretation, pressed into the Roman interest. The canon had directed that a bishop or a clerk, having a complaint against his metropolitan, should apply to the primate (ἔξαρχον) of the diocese or to the see of Constantinople. The appeal to the primate, says Nicolas, is the rule; the recourse to Constantinople is only allowed as secondary. And by the primate of the diocese the council could mean no other than the vicar of the chief apostle: "ipse est enim primas, qui et primus habetur et summus." Gieseler, after quoting the passage (II. i. 371), very reasonably adds (!!), Nicolas had already turned this canon to use in a somewhat different way. Ep. ad Car. Calv. ap. Hard. v. 585.

[h] Coll. 182-4; 192-3.

[i] Col. 168. [k] Col. 171.

[m] Col. 193. [n] Col. 172.

Roman council to the clergy of Constantinople, with a long detail of the affair;[o] and at the same time wrote to Photius, Ignatius, Bardas, Theodora, and the empress Eudoxia. Nov. 866.

Michael looked out for some means of annoying the pope. Although Charlemagne's imperial title had been acknowledged at Constantinople, it was as emperor of the Franks, not of Rome; and his successors had not obtained from the east any higher title than that of king.[p] Michael now offered to recognise Louis II. as emperor, on condition of his acknowledging the council which was so offensive to the pope; and Louis appeared willing to do so.[q] But events soon occurred which rendered this negotiation abortive.

A new question arose to complicate the differences between the Greek and the Latin churches. The Bulgarians, who are supposed to have been a people of Asiatic origin, of the same stock with the Huns, and at one time seated near the sea of Azov, had, about the year 680, occupied a territory in Mœsia and Dardania, where, in consequence of intermarriages with the native Slaves, they had gradually exchanged their original language for a dialect of the Slavonic.[r] They had been engaged in continual hostilities with the Byzantine empire; Nicephorus had lost his life in war with them, and they had endangered the throne of Michael Rhangabe. In the early part of the ninth century Christianity had been introduced among them by some captives, but with little effect. During the regency of Theodora a monk named Cupharas, in whom the empress took an interest, fell into the hands of the Bulgarian prince Bogoris; and the empress proposed that he should be exchanged for a sister of Bogoris, who was then a captive at Constantinople. The Bulgarian princess, who had been converted to the Gospel during her captivity, zealously attempted, after returning to her own country, to carry on the work which Cupharas had begun. Bogoris himself held out, until, during a famine, after having in vain addressed himself to other deities, he had recourse to the God of the Christians; the result was that he was converted, and was baptised by the patriarch of Constantinople, changing his name for that of the emperor Michael, who by proxy acted as his godfather.[s] The convert requested Michael to send him a painter

[o] Ep. 10, col. 196, seqq.

[p] Ῥηξ, not Βασιλεύς. See Pagi, xiii. 65; Gibbon, iv. 510.

[q] Vit. Ign. 981; Schlosser, 614-5.

[r] See Schröckh, xxi. 399; Gibbon, v. 290-1; Gfrörer, Karol. i. 430.

[s] Cedrenus, 539-40. The date of the baptism is variously given—from 845 to 864; but the later time appears to be the more correct. Pagi (xv. 53) and Gieseler (IX. i. 372) place it in 861. See Schröckh, xxi. 404. According to another account, Bogoris invaded the empire, and, having been reduced to

for the decoration of his palace; and a monk named Methodius—for art was then confined to the monasteries—was sent into Bulgaria. Bogoris employed him to paint a hall with *terrible* subjects, intending that these should be taken from the perils of hunting; whereupon Methodius painted the Last Judgment, as being the most terrible of all scenes. The representation of hell, which was explained as setting forth the future lot of the heathen, alarmed the prince into abandoning the idols which he had until then retained; and many of the Bulgarians were moved by the sight of the picture to seek admission into the church.[t] A rebellion which soon after broke out in consequence of the prince's conversion was put down by him with a cruelty which accorded ill with his new profession.[u]

Photius was probably the patriarch who had officiated at the baptism of Bogoris; and he had addressed to him a long letter, or rather treatise,[x] on Christian doctrine and practice, and particularly on the duties of a sovereign. But soon after this we find that the Bulgarian prince made an application to Nicolas, accompanied by valuable presents, for the purpose of obtaining his counsel and assistance towards the conversion of his people.[y] It would seem that he had been perplexed between the claims of rival forms of Christianity—Greek, Roman, and Armenian,[z]—and he may very naturally have wished for some instruction better adapted to his state of knowledge than the somewhat too refined treatise which he had received from the patriarch of Constantinople.[a] But in addition to this, it is most likely that he was actuated by a jealous dread of the empire which bordered so closely on him, and by an apprehension of the consequences which might result from a religious connexion with his ancient enemies.[b] Nicolas replied by sending into Bulgaria Paul bishop of Populonia, and Formosus bishop of Portus, with a letter in which the questions proposed to him were answered under 106 heads.[c] This document, while it displays the usual lofty pretensions of Rome, is highly creditable to the good sense and to the Christian feeling of the writer. He sets aside many frivolous questions, and answers others with a wise treatment of their indifference, and with care to abstain from laying down minutely rigid rules. He rebukes the harshness which had

straits, offered to become Christian as a condition of peace. Schlosser, 629.

[t] Cedren. 540-1.

[u] Nicol. Resp. ad Consulta Bulgar. c. 17, ap. Hard. v.

[x] Phot. Ep. 1.

[y] Anastas. 260.

[z] Nic. Respons. 106.

[a] Neander, v. 424.

[b] Schröckh, xxiv. 149-151.

[c] Responsa ad Consulta Bulgarorum, Hard. v. 353-386. (Aug. 866.)

been shown to a Greek who had pretended to the character of a priest;[d] he censures the king for the cruelty with which he had suppressed the late rebellion, but tells him that, as he acted in zeal for the faith, and rather from ignorance than from wickedness, he may hope for forgiveness if he repent;[e] and he exhorts him to refrain from the use of force against those who continue in their idolatry—to hold no communion with them, but to deal with them by the weapons of reason only.[f] He advises that torture should no longer be used to discover the guilt of criminals,[g] and that such persons should be treated with a gentleness becoming the faith which the Bulgarians had adopted.[h] The cross is to be substituted for the horse's tail, which had hitherto been the national standard.[i] Idolatrous practices, charms, and arts of divination are to be forsaken.[k] Those who, as heathens, had married two wives must put away the second, and do penance—polygamy being no less against the original condition of man than against the law of Christ.[m] In answer to the request that a patriarch might be appointed for the country, he says that he must wait for the report of his envoys as to the number of Christians; in the mean time he sends a bishop, and promises to send more if required; and when the church is organised, one with the title of archbishop, if not of patriarch, shall be placed at its head.[n] He tells them that there are properly only three patriarchal sees—those of Constantinople and Jerusalem, although so styled, being of inferior honour, because they were not of apostolical foundation;[o] and he concludes by exhorting them, amidst the claims of conflicting teachers, to cleave to the holy Roman church, which had always been without spot or wrinkle.[p]

Bogoris had also applied to Louis of Germany, who sent him a bishop; but it is said that this bishop, on arriving in Bulgaria, found the country sufficiently provided with clergy from Rome, and returned home without having attempted to aid or to interfere with their labours.[q]

[d] Cc. 14-6.
[e] C. 17.
[f] Cc. 41, 102.
[g] C. 86.
[h] Cc. 19-32.
[i] C. 33.
[k] Cc. 35, 62, 67, 77, 79.
[m] C. 37.
[n] C. 72.
[o] C. 92.
[p] C. 106.
[q] Annal. Fuld. 867, ap. Pertz, i. 380. The western writers in general speak as if the conversion of Bulgaria had been entirely the work of the Latin church (Schröckh, xxiv. 149-151). Regino (Ann. 868, ap. Pertz, i. 580) relates that the king, after having for a time combined the strictest asceticism in private with the outward pomp of royalty, withdrew into a monastery; that his son, who succeeded to the throne, gave himself up to profligacy, and attempted to restore paganism; that the old king thereupon left his retreat, made war on his son, blinded and imprisoned him, and bestowed the crown on a younger son, whom he threatened to treat in the same manner if he should not be faithful to his duty. He then returned to his cloister.

But at Constantinople the intervention of the pope aroused great indignation. Nicolas claimed Bulgaria on the ground that it had belonged to the Roman jurisdiction while it was a province of the empire—that the people had voluntarily placed themselves under him, and that he had provided them with churches and clergy; while Photius insisted on his right as derived from the conversion of the nation.[r] The patriarch summoned a council to meet at Constantinople, and in a circular to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem,[s] denounced the invasion of Bulgaria. Within the last two years, he says, men from the west, the region of darkness, had intruded into this portion of his fold, corrupting the Gospel with pernicious novelties.[t] They taught a difference of usages as to fasting, they forbade the clergy to marry, they denied the right of presbyters to confirm, and their bishops, in opposition to apostles, fathers, and councils, administered a second unction to persons who had already been confirmed according to the Greek rite.[u] But above all, they adulterated the creed with spurious additions, affirming that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. He reprobates this doctrine with all his force, as a denial of the unity of principle in the Godhead, unheard of by Athanasius, Gregory, and Basil—as a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, or rather against the whole Trinity, such as cannot be exceeded, and is deserving of ten thousand anathemas.[x] He denounces the Romans as apostate and servants of Antichrist;[y] and he invites the oriental patriarchs to send envoys to Constantinople for the purpose of co-operating with him in resistance to them.[z] Although Photius had great reason to complain both of the interference with his converts, and of the manner in which Nicolas had set aside all but the Roman customs, he appears to be open to the charge of swelling his personal quarrel with Rome into a schism between the churches;[a] and the tone in which he now enlarged on the difference of usages was very unlike that in which he had some years before adverted to them in his elaborate letter to Nicolas.[b] The synod was held in 867, and replied to the pope's anathemas by pronouncing a like sentence against him.[c]

In the mean time important political changes were in progress.

[r] Schröckh, xxiv. 154.

[s] Ep. 2. Baronius is very abusive in his comments on this epistle, some of which rest on the ground that Photius was an eunuch (e. g. 867. 67; 868. 45)—which Pagi shows to be untrue. xv. 149.

[t] P. 49.

[u] P. 50.

[x] Pp. 50, 52-3, 56-7.

[y] P. 55.

[z] P. 57.

[a] Schröckh, xxiv. 160.

[b] Phot. ap. Baron. 861. 42-4.

[c] Schröckh, xx. 153.

Bardas had gradually acquired a more and more complete ascendancy over his nephew, while the emperor sank continually deeper into degrading pleasures.[d] In 862 Bardas was made Cæsar. His rule was oppressive to the people; but it is acknowledged that he exhibited much talent for government,[e] and that he exerted himself for the revival of learning, which had long been neglected at Constantinople.[f] But his influence was disturbed by that of a new favourite, Basil the Macedonian. The pedigree of Basil was afterwards deduced from the Persian Arsacidæ, from Alexander the Great, and from Constantine;[g] but he was really of Slavonic race, and was born in a humble station. His first appearance at Constantinople was as a needy adventurer, seeking shelter for a night in the porch of a monastery,[h] where the abbot, it is said, was thrice warned by visions to open the gate to him. Basil found employment as servant to a kinsman of the emperor, and after a time was introduced to the notice of Michael, whom he charmed by his accomplishments as a wrestler, a jockey, and a toper.[i] The emperor bestowed on him one of his own mistresses in marriage,[k] and Bardas began to take alarm; but Michael and Basil gave him a solemn assurance of safety, signed by the emperor's own hand.[m] Soon after, however, his murder was concerted while on a military expedition. The assassins, to whom the signal was given by the sign of the cross, hesitated to strike him in the imperial presence; but Basil gave the first blow from behind, and the victim was despatched while embracing the emperor's feet.[n] After a short interval, during which the vigour of Bardas was missed in the government, and complaints of the general discontent reached the ears of Michael, Basil was advanced to the degree of Cæsar, and on Whitsunday 867 was crowned by the emperor's hands with a diadem which had been blessed by Photius.[o] He immediately began to display talents of a different order from those which had won for him the imperial favour, and endeavoured to put some restraint on the increasing grossness of his patron's debaucheries; but the attempt provoked Michael to such a degree that he is said in his drunken frenzy to have given orders for the Cæsar's death,

[d] Cedren. 547.

[e] Vit. Ign. 955; Cedren. 550-1; Finlay, ii. 336.

[f] Cedren. 547. See the remarkable history of the philosopher Leo, bishop of Thessalonica, in Cedrenus, 548-550.

[g] Cedren. 557. See Gibbon, iv. 425; Finlay, ii. 272.

[h] Cedren. 560.

[i] Cedren. 563-4.

[k] Schlosser, 630-1.

[m] Cedren. 566; Schlosser, 634-8.

[n] Cedren. 555-6; Schlosser, 639. Baronius traces the fate of Bardas to his guilt in opposing the pope. 867, 75, seqq.

[o] Cedren. 567; Schlosser, 644.

and to have announced an intention of promoting a boatman in his room. Basil felt that he must sacrifice the emperor's life or his own, and by his command Michael, after supping in his company, was murdered on the 24th of September, 867.[p] A Greek historian can find no other redeeming fact in the life of this wretched prince than that he bestowed a chalice and a splendid chandelier on the church of St. Sophia.[q] Basil found an exhausted treasury, and exerted himself with vigour and success to replenish it and to restore the empire.[r]

Two days after the death of Michael, Photius was deposed.[s] He had formerly been on friendly terms with Basil, and contradictory accounts are given of the reason for his deposition. By some it is explained in a manner discreditable to him,[t] while others say that he provoked Basil by refusing the communion to him as a murderer.[u]

Nicolas had written to Hincmar, detailing the history of the Bulgarian affair, and requesting the assistance of the Frankish clergy, who had the highest character for learning in the west, to combat the attacks which had been made by the Greeks on the Christianity of the Latins.[x] Hincmar hereupon desired Odo bishop of Beauvais, and other divines, to collect materials for a general defence.[y] The result was the production of treatises by Odo, Æneas of Paris, and Ratramn. That of Æneas is chiefly remarkable as containing what is supposed to be the earliest distinct mention of Constantine's donation.[z] The work of Ratramn is described as the most valuable.[a] In opposition to the line usually taken by Nicolas, the monk of Corbie dwells on the sufficiency of uniting in faith, and censures the Greeks, not for varying from the Roman usages, but for insisting on their own as exclusively correct and necessary.[b]

[p] Cedren. 567; Pagi, xv. 115; Schlosser, 653-8; Finlay, ii. 232.

[q] Cedren. 557.

[r] Cedren. 567-8, 570, 577-8.

[s] Schröckh, xxiv. 161-2. Mr. Finlay says that he remained in office two *years*. ii. 274.

[t] Zonaras ap. Baron. 867. 101.

[u] Schröckh, xxiv. 161-2. Such an act seems hardly agreeable to the character of Photius, who had not scrupled to associate with Michael and Bardas, notwithstanding their vices (Neander, vi. 315). Nor is it probable that, if such a refusal had been given, he would, in reminding Basil of their former friendship, have said in particular, "You have received at my hands the holy mysteries" (p. 97). Baronius solves the question, in his own way, by saying that he was deposed in consequence of the condemnation by Nicolas. 867. 101.

[x] Nic. Ep. 70; Hincm. ii. 809. Some of the charges which he mentions as calumnious were not without foundation in the practice of *some* among the Latins. See Gieseler, II. i. 375.

[y] Opera, ii. 610.

[z] Schröckh, xxiv. 176-8. The prologue is given by Hardouin, v. 314-8.

[a] Mabillon, VI. lxxxi.; Schröckh, xxiv. 178-183.

[b] Neander, vi. 314.

Basil reinstated Ignatius in the patriarchate with great pomp,[c] and sent a member of each party to Rome, accompanied by one of his own officers, for the purpose of representing the state of affairs. At the same time Ignatius sent a letter, in which the authority of St. Peter's successors was acknowledged in terms such as had not been usual at Constantinople.[d] The envoy of Photius was shipwrecked and died on the journey,[e] so that his cause was left without an advocate. Adrian, who had now succeeded Nicolas, assembled a synod which renewed the former sentence against Photius.[f] It was ordered that the copy of the Byzantine synod's acts which had been transmitted to Rome should be burnt, and that those at Constantinople should share the same fate.[g]

A council which is regarded in the Roman church as the eighth General Council,[h] met at Constantinople in October 869. It was attended by two bishops and a deacon from Rome; Antioch was represented by the metropolitan of Tyre, Jerusalem by a presbyter;[i] and to these a representative of the Alexandrian see was added at the ninth session.[k] Some high civil officers were present, but the number of bishops was at first exceedingly small;[m] and, although afterwards gradually increased, it did not rise beyond 60 at the ninth session, and 102 or 109 at the tenth and last.[n]

On the first day the sentence of the late Roman council against Photius was adopted, and all bishops who afterwards joined the assembly were required to sign it.[o] The second, third, and fourth sessions were chiefly occupied in dealing with bishops and clergy who, after having been ordained by Ignatius or his predecessor, had submitted to Photius. These presented a confession of their

[c] Vit. Ign. 985.

[d] The letters of the emperor and of the patriarch are in Hard. v. 790-3.

[e] Vit. Ign. 985. Anastasius the Librarian makes an edifying use of the shipwreck,—"Qui navim Christi, hoc est ecclesiam, sciderat, navis suæ scissionem non inconvenienter incurrit." Hard. v. 754.

[f] Hard. v. 862-871.

[g] Ib. 874.

[h] See Baron. 869. §1-4; Pagi, xv. 180; Palmer on the Church, ii. 215.

[i] Hard. v. 764, 771.

[k] Hard. v. 884, 1092. There are two reports of this council—the one in Latin, by Anastasius the Librarian, who was then at Constantinople for the purpose of negotiating a marriage between the families of Louis II. and Basil (Hard. v. 755), the other Greek; and they vary very considerably. In the Latin acts there are 27 canons (Hard. v. 899, seqq.); in the Greek only 14 (ib. 1097, seqq.): the reason being, perhaps, that the Latins prepared the larger number, while the Greeks inserted in their report such only as related to the main subject (Schröckh, xxiv. 170-1). Among those which are found in Latin only are some which lay down pseudoisidorian doctrines as to the position of metropolitans, and the trial of bishops (ib. 17, 26). One, directed against the iconoclasts, is found in both versions (c. 3 Gr.; c. 7 Lat.); and a Frank writer, the continuator of Aimoin, speaks of this as contrary to the orthodox doctrine of the fathers. Gieseler, II. i. 377.

[m] Ib. 764-5; 1025-7.

[n] Held prid. Kal. Mart. 870. See Pagi, xv. 163; Schröckh, xxiv. 164-5.

[o] Hard. v. 773, 817.

offences, alleging that they had been forced or deceived into them; and they were admitted to communion on condition of performing some penitential exercises. At the fourth session there was a sharp discussion with a bishop named Theophilus, who was firm in his adherence to Photius.[p] The patriarch himself was brought forward on the fifth day, and met the questions addressed to him by a dignified silence. When urged to speak, he replied that God would hear him although he said nothing. "You will not," said the Roman legates, "by your silence escape a greater condemnation." "Neither," he replied, "did Jesus escape condemnation by holding his peace;" and he resumed his former silence.[q] When the president of the council, Branes, who treated him with a courtesy unlike the behaviour of the ecclesiastics, afterwards asked him what he could allege in his justification, he answered, "My justifications are not in this world."[r]

The emperor appeared at the sixth session, and told the council that he had absented himself from its earlier meetings lest he should be supposed to influence its decision as to Photius.[s] But the affair of the patriarch was not yet concluded. He was cited before the council on the seventh day, and entered leaning on a staff—"Take away his staff," said the Roman legate Marinus, "it is an ensign of pastoral dignity."[t] The bishops of his party in vain appealed to the canons.[u] Anathemas were pronounced against Photius and his adherents, the most odious epithets being attached to their names;[x] the writings and documents on his side were burnt;[y] and, in token of the exasperation by which the council was animated, it is said that the condemnation of the patriarch was subscribed in the wine of the eucharistic cup.[z]

But it appeared that the personal question as to the patriarchate was not the only subject which divided Rome from Constantinople. The Romans complained that the pope's letter had been mutilated in the reading; the Greeks told Ignatius that his church had been made the servant of Rome; and Ignatius himself was as resolute as Photius to assert the jurisdiction of his see over Bulgaria.[a] Some ambassadors from that country were at Constantinople, and their master—by what influence is unknown—had been again induced

[p] Hard. v. 782, seqq.
[q] Ib. 819, 1051.
[r] Ib. 822, 1054.
[s] Ib. 835, 1064.
[t] Ib. 859, 1065.
[u] Ib. 841.
[x] Ib. 873.
[y] Ib. 875, 1086.
[z] Vit. Ign. 988. The biographer, however, thinks that Photius was too gently treated, and cites prodigies which soon after happened in favour of this opinion. 988-9. In the subscriptions to the acts of the council, the Roman legates stand first, while Basil and his sons do not sign until after the representatives of all the patriarchates. Hard. v. 922-3.
[a] Schröckh, xxiv. 173.

to waver in his religious allegiance. The emperor summoned them into his presence, with Ignatius, the Roman legates, and the representatives of the eastern patriarchs; and they asked to which church they must consider their country to belong. The orientals inquired to which it had belonged while a province of the empire, and whether the clergy at the time of the Bulgarian conquest had been Greeks or Latins. It was answered that the province had been subject to Constantinople, and that the clergy found in it were Greeks, and on these grounds it was adjudged that Bulgaria ought to belong to the patriarchate of Constantinople. The Roman legates disputed the alleged facts, and handed to Ignatius a paper from the pope, charging him not to interfere, which the patriarch received in a respectful manner, but did not further regard. The emperor dismissed the Roman legates with coolness.[b] Ignatius in the same year consecrated an archbishop for Bulgaria, and within a short time all the Latin clergy were ejected from that country.[c]

John VIII. wrote to the Bulgarians, exhorting them to return to the communion of his church, which they had formerly chosen, and warning them as to the danger of a connexion with the Greeks, who, he said, were always in one heresy or another.[d] He wrote to Ignatius, telling him, that, as he was indebted to the apostolic see for his dignity, so he should lose it, if he kept possession of Bulgaria. The Greek clergy, who were already excommunicate for introducing their errors into a church planted by the holy see, must be withdrawn within thirty days; and Ignatius is threatened with excommunication and deposition if he should neglect the order.[e] Letters in a like tone were written to the Bulgarian king, and to the Greek clergy in that country;[f] and a violent collision would probably have ensued, but for the death of Ignatius, which took place in 878. A.D. 878.

Photius, after his deprivation, had at first been treated with extreme severity. He complains in his letters that he is strictly guarded by soldiers; that he is deprived of all intercourse with relations, friends, monks, and clergy; that his property is confiscated, that he is allowed no service, and in his sickness can obtain no medicines.[g] He suffers from hunger, and yet more from "a famine of the word of God;" he is separated from all books—a

[b] Vit. Hadriani ap. Murator. v. 267-8; Schröckh, xxiv. 173-5.

[c] Vit. Hadr. 344; Pagi, xv. 218. It was to this archbishop that Peter of Sicily addressed his account of the Paulicians.

[d] Hard. vi. 16, 19.

[e] Hard. vi. 20.

[f] Ib. 22, 50, 56, 59, &c.

[g] Ep. 97, p. 137.

cruelty unexampled in the persecutions of the orthodox by heretics or by pagans,[h]—and in the mean time his adherents are cruelly treated, churches are destroyed, holy things are profaned, the poor, whom he had tended for the benefit of his soul, are left friendless and helpless.[i] He inveighs against the synod of 869 as having neglected all the forms of justice in its dealings with him—as worse than anything that had been known among the most lawless and savage heathens.[k]

But after a time he found means to recover the favour of Basil. According to the biographer of Ignatius, he drew up an imaginary pedigree, tracing the emperor's ancestry to the Persian kings; this was written in antique letters on parchment of corresponding appearance; it was bound in the cover of an old manuscript, and was introduced into the library of the palace by the keeper, who took an opportunity of showing it to Basil, and suggested that Photius was the only man capable of explaining it.[m] A still more unlikely tale asserts that the emperor's love was won by charms administered in his food and drink.[n] But it would seem that in truth Basil, out of regard for the unequalled learning of Photius, recalled him from banishment, and appointed him tutor to Leo, the heir apparent of the crown.[o] While thus employed, he was reconciled with Ignatius, and from that time lived on good terms with him, steadily refusing to become the head of a party in opposition to the aged patriarch.[p]

He was now raised to the see as successor of Ignatius, and announced his promotion to John VIII., with a request that the pope would send legates to a new synod which was to be held at Constantinople.[q] The chief object of this application was to secure the assistance of Rome for the purpose of quieting the Ignatian party;[r] but John seized on it as an acknowledgment that the title of Photius to the patriarchal throne depended on his judgment, and supposed that the Byzantines would be willing to bear anything for the sake of obtaining his countenance. Two bishops and a priest were sent as legates, with letters and instructions in which it was said that Photius might be restored if he would make satisfaction for his offences and would ask mercy of the

Aug. 16, 879.

[h] Ep. 97, p. 138; Ep. 174, p. 247.
[i] Ep. 97, p. 137; 174, pp. 248, 250, 240.
[k] Epp. 117-8.
[m] Vit. Ign. 1004.
[n] Hard. v. 1149.
[o] Schröckh, xxiv. 186.
[p] So Photius himself said in the synod of 879. Hard. vi. 256.
[q] Hard. vi. 1152. Gregory of Syracuse, who had shared the misfortunes of Photius, now received the bishoprick of Nicæa, in which he died soon after. Vit. Ign. 1008.
[r] Neander, vi. 322-3.

synod; and it was insisted on that he should resign all pretensions to Bulgaria.[s] The ensigns of the patriarchal dignity were transmitted in the same manner which had been usual in bestowing the pall on metropolitans.[t]

The synod was imposing as to numbers, consisting of 380 bishops from the empire, with the three Roman legates, and three deputies from the oriental patriarchs.[u] The precedent set by the second council of Nicæa, of having representatives from the oriental thrones, had been followed in the councils of 861 and 869. But in the latter of these, the representatives of the east had declared that those who had taken part in the synod under Photius were impostors, with forged credentials.[x] Photius, however, asserted that those who made that declaration were themselves not only impostors, but agents of the Saracens;[y] and letters were now produced from Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, in which the patriarchs disavowed those who had acted in their names, and disowned all connexion with the proceedings against Photius.[z]

The Roman legates found that matters were conducted in a very different way from what the courteous behaviour of Photius had led them to expect. Instead of submitting himself to their judgment he assumed the presidency of the council from the beginning—declaring that both his first and his second elevation had been forced on him—that he had committed no wrong, and did not need any mercy.[a] The pope's letters were read, but with omissions of the more violent pretensions, and with insertions to the honour of the patriarch.[b] The demand of Bulgaria was, with great professions of respect for Rome, evaded as being foreign to the question in hand.[c] The Greek bishops all supported the patriarch, and acted as if in entire independence of Rome.[d]

[s] Hard. v. 1165, 1185; vi. 207, 1168-9.

[t] Neander, vi. 323.

[u] Schröckh, xxiv. 188-9.

[x] The synod discovered the persons who had taken on themselves the character of envoys. They said that, having come to Constantinople on other business, they had been induced by Photius to appear in his synod, and on this ground he was anathematised in the 9th canon. Hard. v. 874-7, 901, or 1085-9, 1100.

[y] Ep. 116, p. 159. The explanation offered by the opposite party is, that the patriarch of Jerusalem, in order to avert the suspicions of the Saracens, had given the envoys instructions to negotiate for the redemption of Saracen captives at Constantinople. Hard. vi. 1160.

[z] Hard. vi. 300-1, 525.

[a] Hard. vi. 253-7.

[b] See Hard. v. 1165, seqq.; vi. 63-72, 231, seqq.; 246, seqq., 277, seqq., 1152.

[c] Hard. vi. 252, 309.

[d] Hard. vi. 312; Schröckh, xxiv. 192-3. This synod is regarded by the Greeks as the eighth general council—that of 869 being disallowed; and it answers all the usual conditions of a general council. But the Romanists speak of it as a Photian conventicle, and censure John for consenting to it in any degree. Baronius supposes the fable of Pope Joan to have taken its origin from the pope's weakness in yielding to the wishes of Basil (879. 1-6)—a supposition

It was only by degrees that John became acquainted with the result of the council. At first, he declared himself willing to confirm its restoration of Photius, if he should find that the legates had not disobeyed their instructions. Misconstruing the polite phrases of the Greeks, he supposed that Bulgaria had been given up to him, and wrote to thank the emperor for the concession; while in a letter to Photius he expressed surprise that in some respects his directions had not been followed by the council.[e] But when he discovered the real state of the matter, his exasperation was unbounded. He ascended the pulpit of a church, holding the book of the Gospels in his hand, and threatened to anathematise all who should not regard Photius as one condemned by God's judgment, according to the sentences of Nicolas and Adrian;[f] and he sent Marinus, one of the legates who had attended the council under Ignatius,[g] to insist that matters should be restored to the state which had been established by that council. But the legate was treated with indignity, was imprisoned for a month at Constantinople, and returned without any success.[h] On the death of John, Marinus was raised to the papacy; and the sentence against Photius was renewed by him,[i] by Adrian III., and by Stephen V., who had an angry correspondence on the subject with Basil and his son Leo VI.[k]

Aug. 13, 880.

Leo, formerly the pupil of Photius, on his accession in 886, deposed the patriarch, confined him in a monastery, and filled the see with his own brother Stephen, a boy of sixteen.[m] The reasons of this step are unknown; the Greek writers in general trace it to a suspicion that Photius was implicated with a monk named Theodore Santabarenus, who had endeavoured to alienate the late em-

very inconsistent with the general character of John. The same historian ventures to conjecture that the acts of the council were forged by Photius (897. 73); and the extravagant idea has been more confidently repeated by others, e. g. by Rohrbacher, who speaks in his index of the "Fourberie de Photius, peut-être unique dans l'histoire." (See also vol. xii. 237, and Schröckh, xxiv. 193-5; Gieseler, II. i. 380.) This charge may have originated in the story told by the biographer of Ignatius, that Photius forged the acts of a synod against his rival, and sent them to Louis II. (see above, p. 343). Baronius says that the synod of 879 is "una cum auctore in imis inferis obruenda" (879. 63). Döllinger more reasonably contents himself with comparing it to the Latrocinium of Ephesus, with the exception that what was there done by violence was here done by craft (i. 396). A marginal note on the council (Hard. vi. 331) asserts that the sixth and seventh sessions were invented by Photius; but Hardouin regards this as the trick of some "Graculus," in order to bespeak credit for the earlier sessions!

[e] Ep. 108, ad Phot.; Ep. 109 ad Imperatores, Hard. vi. 87-8.

[f] Hard. v. 1161; Baron. 880. 11.

[g] P. 350.

[h] Stephan. V. ap. Hard. vi. 367.

[i] Baron. 882. 12.

[k] See Hard. v. 1116, seqq.; vi. 365, seqq.

[m] Pagi, xv. 16.

peror from his son.[n] An inquiry into the conduct of Photius took place, and no evidence could be found against him; but he did not recover his see, and he died in exile in the year 891.[o] The two parties which had divided the church of Constantinople were reconciled within a few years; but Pope John IX. made difficulties as to recognising the clergy who had been ordained by Photius.[p] At length, however, the churches resumed communion, and the name of Photius himself was among those of the patriarchs acknowledged by Rome.[q] But political jealousies, and the retention of Bulgaria by the Byzantine patriarchate, together with the difference as to rites and doctrine, continued to keep up a coolness between the sees, until at a later time they again broke out into open discord.

A.D. 898.

[n] Cedren. 593; Schröckh, xxiv. 198. An unknown Greek writer, cited by Baronius (880. 16), ascribes it to the emperor's regard for the pope. Gfrörer conjectures that Photius had a scheme for rendering the church independent, and that the emperor meant to defeat this by getting the patriarchate into his own family—Basil having already shown a like intention by bringing up Stephen as an ecclesiastic. Kircheng. iii. 301.

[o] Cedren. 594-5; Pagi, xv. 424; Schröckh, xxiv. 198.

[p] Hard. vi. 479; Baron. 905. 9; Pagi, xv. 539; Schröckh, xxiv. 198-207.

[q] See Baron. 905. 11-2, and Pagi's notes; Schröckh, xxiv. 201.

CHAPTER IV.

SPAIN — ENGLAND — MISSIONS OF THE NINTH CENTURY.

I. The Christians of Spain after the Mahometan conquest, who were known by the name of *Mustaraba* or *Mozarabes*,[a] enjoyed the free exercise of their religion, although on condition of paying a heavy monthly poll-tax.[b] They generally lived on friendly terms with their Musulman masters; many of them held office under the caliphs, and monks and clergy who understood both the Arabic and the Latin languages were employed in diplomatic correspondence.[c]

But, notwithstanding these relations, the difference of religion was a continual source of trouble. The Mahometan mobs often abused Christians in the streets; they shouted out blasphemies against the Christian name, while all retaliation was forbidden by law under very severe penalties. Marriages sometimes took place between professors of the two religions; in such a case it was death for the Mahometan party to embrace Christianity,—as it was to apostatise from Islam in any way; and questions arose as to the religion of the issue which led to serious difficulties. Moreover, the hostility of the Musulmans towards the Christians who dwelt among them was excited by the persevering efforts of those who in other parts of the peninsula carried on a war of independence; while these efforts served also to raise among the Christians under the Mahometan rule a desire to do something for the more public assertion of their faith.[d]

The Christians were divided into two parties. The one of these was bent on preserving peace with their rulers, as far as possible, and for enjoying the toleration which was allowed them. The other party regarded this acquiescence as unworthy; they thought that their brethren had been corrupted by intercourse with the Moslems into a blameable laxity of opinions. They declared that the offices of Mahometan courts could not be held without compli-

[a] The name does not mean (as has been mistakenly said) *mixti, Arabibus*, but *Arabes insitivii*—grafted on the stock of the *Arabi Arabi*, or pure Arabs. Gieseler, II. i. 147.

[b] Eulogius, Memoriale Sanctorum, in Bibl. Patr. xv. 249, b.

[c] Neander, v. 462-3.

[d] Gieseler, II. i. 147.

ances unbecoming a Christian; that those who occupied such offices were obliged to refrain from openly signing themselves with the cross, and from other outward manifestations of their faith; that they were obliged to speak of the Saviour in such terms as might not be offensive to the unbelievers. They complained that the Christian youth preferred the cultivation of "Chaldean" to that of ecclesiastical literature; that they were more familiar with Arabic than with Latin.[e]

About the middle of the ninth century a persecution of the Christians broke out at Cordova under the reign of Abderrahman II. The first victim was a monk named Perfectus, who, having fallen in with some Mahometans in the neighbourhood of the city, was questioned by them as to the opinion which Christians entertained of the Prophet. He attempted to evade the question, on the ground that he was unwilling to offend them; but, as they continued to urge him, and assured him that no offence would be taken, he said that Mahomet was regarded by Christians as one of the false prophets foretold in Scripture; and he remarked on some parts of his history, as scandalous, and as proving the falsehood of his pretensions. The Arabs, in consideration of the promise which they had given, restrained their anger for the time; but when Perfectus next appeared in public, he was seized, was dragged before a judge, on a charge of blasphemy against the Prophet, and was executed.[f] A merchant, who had given no provocation, was next put to death.[g] But the third victim, a young monk named Isaac, courted his fate. He went before the judge of the city, professing an inclination to embrace the religion of the Koran, and begging for some instruction in its doctrines. But when these were explained to him, he denounced their falsehood with great vehemence.[h] The execution of Isaac was followed by an outburst of fanatical zeal. Clergymen, monks, nuns, and laity rushed before the Mahometan tribunals, reviling the Prophet as an impostor, an adulterer, a sorcerer, and declaring that his followers were in the way to perdition.[i] And, besides those who thrust themselves on death, many children of mixed marriages were delated by their Mahometan relations as apostates, although they had probably been brought up from the first in the religion of the Christian parent.[k]

A.D. 850.

A.D. 851.

[e] Alvari Indicul. Luminosus, c. 9, in Flores, España Sagrada, xi. Madr. 1792.
[f] Alvar. 3; Eulog. ii. 1.
[g] Eulog. ib. col. 246, f.; Alvar. 5.
[h] Eulog. Præf. 243; Alvar. 12.
[i] Eulog. ad Willesind. Bibl. Patr. xv. 300, c. Details of the martyrdoms in Mem. SS. ii. 3, seqq.
[k] See Eulog. Mem. SS. ii. 8.

The wild zeal of the Christians naturally exasperated the Moslems. Public outrages against Christians increased; any one who showed himself in the street was insulted, pelted with filth, or stoned: the Mahometans shrank from touching the very garments of Christians, as if it were pollution.[m] The sound of church-bells excited them to a tempest of cursing and blasphemies; and at funerals of Christians the populace followed the corpse with outcries begging that God would have no mercy on the deceased.[n]

Abderrahman now enacted new laws, of increased severity. The bodies of those who were executed were to be burnt, lest their brethren should convert them into relics. Yet the caliph, wishing, if possible, to quell the excitement by peaceable means, requested the co-operation of the primate Recanfrid, archbishop of Toledo, who issued an order that no Christian should present himself before a Mahometan judge unless he were cited to do so.[o] Saul, bishop of Cordova, took an opposite line; and Recanfrid proceeded to imprison some refractory ecclesiastics – among them a monk and priest named Eulogius, who had been very conspicuous for his zeal. From prison Eulogius wrote a number of letters, intended to animate the resolution of his party; in the spirit of Tertullian he exhorts all who have any worldly ties to cast them aside and confess the faith.[p] A council was held under the archbishops of Toledo and Seville, and determined that no one ought voluntarily to provoke death by his religion.[q] Those who agreed with the spirit of this council charged the evils which had happened on Eulogius and his friends. They ascribed the conduct of the sufferers to pride, and questioned their right to the name of martyrs—citing against them texts of Scripture with the canons and practice of the early church.[r] Some went so far as to declare that there was no opportunity of martyrdom at the hands of the Arabs, since these were not idolaters, but worshipped the one true God and acknowledged his laws.[s]

A.D. 852.

Eulogius and Peter Alvar were the leading spirits of their party.[t] They both (and more especially Alvar) write in an exalted strain of enthusiasm. Eulogius sets aside the distinction which had been drawn in favour of the Mahometans by saying that they

[m] Eulog. col. 249, d.
[n] Alvar. 6.
[o] Neander, v. 468.
[p] Neander, v. 469.
[q] Hard. v. 37-8, who calls it *conciliabulum*. Baronius is loud against it: 852. 10.
[r] Alvar. 14; Eulog. Mem. SS. ii. 14; col. 248, c.
[s] Eulog. 288, d.
[t] Flores supposes Eulogius to have written in 851, and Alvar in 854. España Sagrada, xi. 43.

JULY 75
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED